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WORD PROCESSING: Laurie George
This timely and handsome collection of solid, well-conceived, and original studies by twenty-one diverse international contributors investigates an important but insufficiently understood subject: the Byzantine family. Interest in the family has been growing within the ranks of Byzantine historians. This study probes manifold dimensions of Byzantine familial history and includes visual evidence such as paintings, mosaics, ceramics, sigillography, and numismatics (but always as black and white photos) as well as literary evidence. It is an admittedly incomplete inquiry; contributions are not prolix. The collection of essays contributes to an appreciation of the complexity of familial issues, and the editors emphasize the complexity of various aspects of the family.

The extensive chronological and geographical scope of the volume is reasonable: the third to the fifteenth centuries. It includes subject matter that lies beyond whatever passed for the formal borders of frontier zones in the Byzantine Empire. Its contents cover disparate regions of the empire’s interior, including Italy, Anatolia, the Levant, and beyond—specifically Iraq (Baghdad). It incorporates much of the most recent historical scholarship and contains what is effectively a useful checklist of relevant primary sources and preferred editions. An unsurprising deficiency is that one cannot find any tight, coherent, overarching exposition and interpretive framework. No single theoretical framework of social history shapes all of the contributions. Few will read this book continuously end to end. This book will challenge readers, which is not an insuperable problem. Specialists will read chapters selectively in accord with their interests. This is not a handbook guide or introduction, but those who seek such a reliable work can find some assistance here.

No stunning discoveries emerge, but this book includes a collection of noteworthy and solid scholarship. The grouping and order of contributions make sense. The footnotes are well proportioned. The index is useful but limited; it cannot list everything. Both visual and archaeological evidence are handled well. *Approaches to the Byzantine Family* illumines some aspects of Byzantine political and dynastic history. However, it is of limited value for the economic history of the empire.

Among the most valuable presentations for this reviewer are those of Leslie Brubaker, Shaun Tougher, Leonora Neville, Nadia El Cheikh, Claudia Ludwig, and Michel Kaplan. The afterword by Shaun Tougher is, in fact, a concise chapter or section of conclusions and is very helpful. Selected individual
chapters from this volume could be used in university course syllabi even though the book is much too expensive to assign for student purchase.

The publisher, Ashgate, has inserted this work as volume 14 in a respected series of Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman studies that originates at the University of Birmingham (UK). The publication of this book marks a major advance for Byzantine social history, and its publication should stimulate much more research and publication on the Byzantine family and related topics. Honor and status as well as social mobility all receive attention. It cannot be the definitive book on the subject, but it contributes to making the publication of such a book possible in the future.

This study belongs in libraries and institutes for Byzantine, medieval, Mediterranean, Islamic, and women’s and gender histories, as well as archaeology and broader Christian hagiography and ecclesiastical history. It also is very useful for those scholars who have comparative studies perspectives.

University of Chicago

Walter E. Kaegi


Writing the history of the East African Revival has remained largely the prerogative of missionaries, church leaders, and historians of Christianity. These historians saw that the personal testimony was the sine qua non of the revival movement, which they often described as an offspring of British holiness evangelicalism. In these accounts, East African Revival testimonies often stood as universalized devotional accounts of Christian salvation.

In this book, however, the author pries revival converts’ testimonies out of the devotional literature in which they have been embedded and places them back into the warp and weft of late colonial politics in which they were first articulated. Derek R. Peterson explores this world through dozens of archives in Rwanda, Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, and the United Kingdom, layering colonial and missionary materials alongside local church records, grey literature, and personal interviews. Ethnic Patriotism, as a result, is a richly detailed and nuanced history of the work of political imagination of late colonial East Africa’s patriots and dissenters. As such, Peterson’s work is a watershed in how future historians will understand the East African Revival and its relationship to concurrent sociopolitical movements of the late colonial era.
The linguistic, historical, and political work of East Africa’s “ethnic patriots,” which Peterson expositis with characteristic precision and care, is often juxtaposed against the verbose and disruptive revivalists. Peterson, however, places “ethnic patriotism” and the East African Revival under a common rubric of “dissent.” Doing so allows him to offer a novel analysis of how East Africa’s “pilgrims” and “patriots” worked to create constituencies, craft histories, and imagine futures in contradistinction to the status quo—and each other. He demonstrates how and why cosmopolitan revivalists grated against the ethnic particularity articulated by “ethnic patriots” in several regions across East Africa. The author, therefore, reconfigures the history and historiography of late colonial politics. He convincingly argues that local concerns over morals and etiquette provoked ethnic patriots to develop political tools and engage in various kinds of politics, leading them to found organizations, associations, and newspapers with which they developed their political platforms, moral discourse, and historical work.

As for the East African Revival movement, Peterson has here offered the most comprehensive, robust, and creative monograph on the subject. He has succeeded undeniably in embedding revivalists’ testimonies within the contentious and dynamic sociopolitical world of late colonial East Africa. Doing so under the rubric of dissent, however, may be somewhat at variance with Peterson’s dedication to emic expositions of these historical actors. It may be that in giving primary attention to the dissenting dynamics of East African revivalists, Peterson has positioned the movement in a way that, perhaps, few revivalists themselves would accept as an authentic reflection of the nature of the revival movement.

Ethnic Patriotism and the East African Revival solidifies Peterson’s place as an eminent scholar of twentieth-century Sub-Saharan Africa. It has already been honored with the African Studies Association’s Herskovits Award as well as the American Historical Association’s Klein Prize—fitting accolades that are accurate reflections of its painstaking erudition and original historical analysis.

Arizona State University

Jason Bruner

**The Americas**


The Civil War in Missouri produced a chaotic mix of guerrilla warfare and complex political and regional orientations as well as a host of iconic characters that have long captivated the popular imagination. One of the most
remarkable incidents in Missouri’s Civil War, however, has remained in obscurity up to this point. The author brings to life the story of the daring rescue of thirteen slaves at a small train depot as their master planned to transport them for sale in Kentucky.

In this book, John Christgau offers the reader much more than a simple narrative of events, exciting as they proved to be. The author spends much of the book explaining the context for this event, relying as he does on extensive recent scholarship on emancipation and the Civil War in Missouri by a number of historians. Christgau’s engaging style appeals especially to readers not already familiar with the details of the Civil War in the border states, making this book an excellent read for undergraduates and a general, nonspecialist audience. A close read of the transcript of events, including many plausible hypothetical questions for the reader to consider, brings the story to life.

Charles Walker was a slaveholder in the west-central Missouri town of Sedalia. By late 1863, it had become clear that slavery was collapsing in Missouri as persistent guerrilla warfare forced the state’s Unionist provisional government to take stronger measures against the rebellion. But slavery was still legal in the state, and federal military policy remained in a state of flux; the Emancipation Proclamation did not apply to Unionist Missouri, though a mix of military orders gave latitude to Federal officers in their treatment of fugitive slaves reaching Union lines. Adding to the uncertainty of emancipation policy was the complex chain of command within the Union army in which a mix of regular Union officers and pro-Union Missouri State Militia left individual officers with contradictory instructions.

Nevertheless, by the end of 1863 it was clear that the one state where slavery seemed to survive was the fellow Union border state of Kentucky. Hoping to gain some measure of financial remuneration for his slaves as their chattel property value plummeted in war-torn Missouri, Walker boarded the train near Sedalia with plans to sell them in Louisville, Kentucky. However, one of the slaves, named John, escaped and ran ahead to Union soldiers notifying them of the plan and seeking military support to rescue his family. The Federal troops, all from Minnesota, stopped the train at Otterville and removed and freed the slaves, despite the protests of Walker and two militia officers on the train. The Minnesota officers were subsequently arrested for “mutiny” and released only after a national outcry brought attention to the incident.

Some of the accompanying analysis is a bit overwrought or inaccurate. For example, Hannibal Hamlin was a senator from Maine, not Massachusetts as the book states (95). And common nineteenth-century literary techniques such
as signing letters with “your obedient servant” are analyzed too literally (78).

But these small errors in no way detract from this deeply compelling and engaging story, one that is sure to reach a wide audience unfamiliar with the unique nature of the Civil War and emancipation in the border state of Missouri.

Maryville College

Aaron Astor


This work serves to set straight the simplistic but generally accepted account of the 1964 Kitty Genovese murder. It does so in an easy, often entertaining, journalistic style that supports its author’s intent “to tell the whole truth” (4). That truth includes far-ranging events and details not directly relevant to the work’s revisionist purpose. The publisher appropriately lists the book among its general interest works.

The author draws on pop culture and national events of the 1960s, records of police and criminal attorney investigations, surviving bystanders’ memories, the findings of a local attorney/historian immersed in the case for forty years, psychological science (for instance, the phenomenon that multiple bystanders diffuse a sense of responsibility), and recurring conferences about the event hosted by Fordham University psychologist Harold Takooshian. Kevin Cook describes the killer’s eerily cool manner and provides gripping accounts of the murder—accounts, plural, because Cook concludes his twenty-one short chapters with a moving, second account of the murder that is informed by the fifty years of revelations and science triggered by the caricatured event.

The 27 March 1964, *New York Times* front-page story began:

> For more than half an hour 38 respectable, law-abiding citizens in
> Queens watched a killer stalk and stab a woman in three separate
> attacks in Kew Gardens... Not one person telephoned the police
during the assault; one witness called after the woman was dead.

The account turned the event into a benchmark in America’s cultural history. It zapped Americans’ view of themselves and locked in the world’s view of the event for the years that followed. As Cook documents, the account was inaccurate. Only a handful of people could see what was happening, and even these could see only the first of two, not three, attacks. The second—or last—attack occurred around the corner and in the lobby of an apartment building where...
only one person witnessed it. Two persons did phone the police, as Cook demonstrates, and in both of these cases before, not after, the victim had died.

Cook attributes the years of simplistic thinking to Abraham Rosenthal—at the time the city editor of the *Times*, and eventually, for seventeen years, the paper’s top editor. He said Rosenthal sought “emotional punch” in his writers’ work (99). Rosenthal found this punch in the *prima facie* apathy of Kitty’s neighbors.

Other facts chip away at the simple view. The murder occurred close to a bar that periodically spewed scrapping, shouting customers onto the sidewalk in the early morning hours. A neighbor and friend, Sophie Farrar, ran to Kitty dying on the lobby floor and placed a phone call to the police before she died. It was a Queens resident who confronted the killer five days later and got him arrested for burglarizing a neighbor. In 2003 a retired New York City police lieutenant gave a sworn statement: When he was fifteen, he lived directly across from where Kitty was first attacked; he awoke hearing her, looked out the window and saw a man “bent over” her body; he told his father, who then phoned the police, and none came. The next day, when his father told an investigating detective that had they come Kitty could still be alive, he was given a “dirty look” (207, 208). Cook’s corrections are a welcome antidote to the *Times’* 1964 distortions.

*New York, New York*  
Thomas A. Caffrey

*Dangerously Sleepy: Overworked Americans and the Cult of Manly Wakefulness.*  

In this intriguing work, the author traces the persistence of the “cult of manly wakefulness” through its long course in American history. The “cult” has had a diverse and extensive following. Beginning with Cotton Mather and extending into the modern era with votaries such as Thomas Edison and Donald Trump, it has endured even in the face of compelling scientific evidence discounting its major tenet, which is that working extremely long hours, without sleep, into and through the night, is virtuous in itself, evidence of a man’s devotion to his job and commitment to the social good, and indicative of his masculinity.

Alan Derickson begins by rehearsing the scientific case against the cult’s creed, quoting various findings such as the 1993 National Commission on Sleep
Disorders Research. Scientific research about the hazards of sleep deprivation has its own long history, dating back at least to the first decades of the twentieth century. The scientific findings are solid and extensive, exhibiting few major disagreements: Sleeplessness is related to drowsiness and fatigue, a weakening of the immune system that may lead to tuberculosis and other infections, depression, obesity, hypertension, heart attacks, ulcers, diabetes, and even cancer. Moreover, job performance is severely compromised—accidents multiply, judgment is impaired, productivity is reduced, and foul-ups are increased. Wakefulness contradicts its reason, proving damaging rather than enhancing productivity.

In the face of such evidence, why would so many people continue to believe and behave in irrational, self-defeating ways, continuing to deprive themselves of a good night’s sleep? Why would the paragons of science, such as the medical professions, build wakefulness into the required training of interns? Such questions are at the heart of Derickson’s analysis and an invaluable contribution to the history of work.

Searching for answers, Derickson relies for the most part on case studies, reviewing historical examples of the cult’s apostles: the famous, including Benjamin Franklin and Charles Lindbergh, as well as working men and women (mostly men), such as independent, long-haul truckers.

Trying to understand such enduring devotion to self-defeating beliefs and ascetic behaviors, Derickson suggests “a fundamental cultural influence” as the cause; that is, beliefs and values that consistently trump logic and reason (x). He briefly reviews the modern work ethic, the still-emerging belief in work as the primary human good and center of morality. He also suggests recent developments such as globalization are to blame. However, he settles on the identification of long hours with “masculinity” and wakefulness as a primary way to prove male superiority.

Derickson closes with a rehearsal of various reforms, which have been designed to combat the unhealthy outcomes of the cult. He recommends various policies formulated to regulate work hours and schedules and a basic “entitlement” to reasonable sleep time, guaranteed now to work animals such as horses and mules (xiii).

Derickson makes an excellent start, but he has only scratched the surface of a much larger historical phenomenon: the advent and spread of what Josef Pieper called the “world of total work” and what Robert Hutchins called “salvation by work.” One might suggest that wakefulness is itself a symptom of a larger malady: the arrival of a new irrational belief in work in and for
itself—the coming of an aggressive, imperialistic faith, expanding now with dire consequences, including the destruction of the natural world. Few faiths have had such a powerful sway over men’s lives, to the extent that adherents might repeat with the biblical Job, “though he slay me, yet will I trust Him.”

University of Iowa

Benjamin Hunnicutt


The author of this book offers a biographical overview of the thirty-third president of the United States from his birth and family background through the end of his presidency (though a short postscript also addresses his post-presidency). She uses an informal, readable style devoid of notes, which some academics may find jarring but students and other nonspecialists might find particularly appealing. She also weaves psychological analysis throughout the book.

Aida Donald’s writing is particularly strong when she provides insights into Truman’s early life, courtship of Bess Wallace, and military service in World War I. For example, she shows the ways that Truman’s complicated family, especially his mother, shaped him. Truman’s long pursuit of Bess began, it turns out, as a pursuit of the unobtainable, which succeeded only through great persistence (and, perhaps, an eventual willingness of Bess to marry beneath herself).

The author also emphasizes how Truman’s experience as a captain of artillery in the Great War gave him new confidence and showed him for the first time as a leader of men. The harrowing details of engagements with the Germans demonstrate his courage, resourcefulness, and willingness to follow his own instincts under fire. After all was done, “Truman was a new man when he returned home” (65). Indeed, the book’s title is a clue to the author’s view of how pivotal Truman’s military service was.

The account of Truman’s subsequent political career is generally solid as well. The 1948 comeback presidential win is well told but perhaps a bit sparse (for example, little attention is given to Henry Wallace’s third-party campaign, though for some time it posed a greater threat to Truman’s reelection than that of Strom Thurmond). The most illuminating discussion of Truman’s presidency comes in the description of the decision to use the atomic bomb against Japan. The author successfully summarizes the key arguments of Truman’s defenders and anti-Truman revisionists and weighs them in a sophisticated and nuanced way (141–164). Donald does not claim to have a definitive answer to the issue,
but she identifies a number of key questions and soberly reviews the context that made Truman’s decision understandable.

If there are shortcomings in the author’s portrayal of Truman’s presidency, they lie in her treatment of the internal security issue and the “militarization of containment” in Korea. Here, the highlighting of context and use of recently available sources are not as evident. Donald is harshly critical of Truman’s federal loyalty oath program, despite evidence in the Venona cables (now public) that the problem of communist subversion and espionage was a real one. And her skepticism toward Truman’s stand in Korea does not address the only real alternative: Should the naked conquest of South Korea by North Korea simply have been accepted by the United States? Was nonmilitary containment really a viable response to military expansion? These caveats notwithstanding, *Citizen Soldier* provides an interesting, readable, and comprehensive approach to the life and significance of the man from Independence.

*Claremont McKenna College*  
Andrew E. Busch


This book joins a growing number of studies that explore the independence movement during the American Revolution. In particular, the author focuses on the summer of 1776, when independence was debated, declared, and defended. He argues that prior accounts generally emphasize one of two themes: the politics surrounding the debate over independence in the Continental Congress or the military campaign in New York in which George Washington and William Howe fought a series of battles for control over this strategic area. The author suggests that his account is different by contending that “political and military experiences were two sides of a single story, which are incomprehensible unless told together” (ix-x). He proceeds to narrate the political events surrounding the independence movement and the military developments of the New York campaign, attempting to connect them in a meaningful way.

The main political actors in Joseph Ellis’s book are the usual suspects. John Adams is the catalyst behind “The Cause” (the independence movement), and in this telling he labors diligently to achieve a permanent separation from Great Britain. Benjamin Franklin is portrayed as the distinguished statesman whose pragmatic approach tempers the aggressive nature of Adams. Thomas Jefferson becomes the spokesperson of independence through his famous declaration,
which Congress proceeds to dismantle with eighty-five separate changes (something that Jefferson never forgave). In Ellis’s book, the pace for independence is fairly swift and unified, and Congress devotes itself to defending the cause at any cost, even if it means creatively disregarding any negative reports that trickle in from the military campaign in New York. This unity in Congress disintegrates, however, when it attempts to tackle the question of how to govern the newly independent states and debates issues like consolidation, representation, and slavery, which would plague the United States through the Civil War.

Ellis portrays Washington in fatalistic fashion, a man consumed with worry that his inexperienced army and indefensible position would lead to disaster in New York. Washington’s emphasis on honor and reputation resulted in a series of poor choices that put his army in jeopardy. Fortunately for Washington, his British counterparts, brothers Admiral Richard Howe and General William Howe, were more concerned with achieving reconciliation than destroying the American army. This explains the failure of William Howe to crush Washington after winning several key battles in the New York campaign. The author faults both sides for a lack of execution at critical junctures and points out that, ironically, Washington’s leadership contributed to the British victory and only Howe’s caution allowed Washington’s army to escape. For Ellis, the survival of the Continental Army proved to be the salvation of independence in spite of public concern over the presence of a standing army.

Revolutionary Summer is a fine narrative of the political and military developments taking place in 1776. However, the story Ellis tells, including his overall thesis, has been told elsewhere. He relies heavily, for example, on Barnet Schecter’s Battle of New York for the military campaign, and John Ferling (Independence: The Struggle to Set America Free) has already discussed the political connections of independence with the pending military crisis. Ellis’s book provides a good synopsis of the themes covered in these and other prior works, and that is where readers will find its greatest value.

University of West Georgia

Keith Pacholl


This new book has some useful things to tell historians, despite itself. We might as well begin with the flaws so we can better appreciate the accomplishments.
The book is far too long (311 pages, when 200 would have been better), and
the repetition of sentences and quotes reminds the reader of this. It also needed
a good editor. Glenn Feldman’s writing and argument style, as anyone who has
read his many earlier works knows, is neither shy nor subtle. Bombastic and
overblown might be a better description at times, though that is not necessarily
a disparagement as it can also be quite engaging. The title suggests the book
covers the South, whereas its subject is Alabama as representative of “the
South.” That proposition is fair enough except perhaps for the disproportionate
influence of the Birmingham industrial complex in the state’s politics, which
sets it apart from most other southern states. As a result, the study overlooks
quite a bit of secondary literature on the South as a whole and other states that
might have been useful. The dates are a bit deceptive as well; three quarters of
the book concerns the period between 1928 and 1944, essentially the New
Deal era and World War II.

What does this book do well, then? It argues, in Feldman’s unrelenting style,
that “southern liberalism was never what it was cracked up to be” and consist-
tently foundered on the rock of white racism—even in a state such as Alabama,
which was considered relatively liberal in this period (296). Positive evaluations
of Alabama’s liberalism, from contemporaries and later historians, Feldman
suggests, were delusional—the product of a political discourse shifted far to the
right by race. After a fairly quick tour through Reconstruction and late
nineteenth-century history, The Irony of the Solid South really hits its stride in
the 1920s. Feldman pays close attention to episodes that often do not get close
scrutiny, such as the 1928 presidential campaign. His significant accomplish-
ment here is to make it clear that the New Deal carried with it the seeds of its
own destruction. Careful accounts of the role of conservative elites in the 1936
election, the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organization (CIO), Governor
Frank Dixon’s campaign against the Fair Employment Practice Committee
(FEPC) in 1942, and other events demonstrate that the conservative shift away
from the Democratic Party was already in motion in the 1930s.

For all the stylistic quirks of Feldman’s book, it contains a significant argu-
ment that historians need to engage. He presents a subtle form of political his-
tory that eschews the traditional narrative of “turning points” and instead
looks at slow shifts, incremental gains and losses, in a way that seems much
more accurate, even if many may dispute his very gloomy conclusions. Based
on a truly prodigious amount of primary source research, the book’s excessive
length at least makes it a treasure trove of excellent anecdotes and juicy quota-
tions that other historians and teachers will be drawing from for years. The
book is, as Feldman’s work tends to be, significant and something we all must consider when thinking about race and politics in the South in the mid-twentieth century.

Newcastle University

Bruce E. Baker


This is a story of desperate white men in South Carolina trying to hold on to their power, honor, masculinity, and dignity in the years following the Civil War. It is also a story of an oppressed people’s first taste of freedom, citizenship, and racial pride as well as a study of women, both black and white, finding their voice. In five chapters, plus an introduction and conclusion, Kate Côté Gillin ably discusses the changed landscape in the Palmetto State during the Civil War and Reconstruction and how afterward white men sought to reclaim what they had once dominated by controlling the land, labor, and politics. Ultimately, organized violence allowed them to reassert their authority, but in the process gender roles were forever changed.

As stated in the introduction, Shrill Hurrahs “explore[s] the rise of violent assaults on southern women of both races, the gendered reasons behind post-war violence and women’s own participation in acts of violence against others in the decades following the Civil War” (2). Students and scholars of Reconstruction and the post-Reconstruction era are familiar with the brutal racial violence of the period. Gillin, however, places women and gender at the front and center of the conversation. The author shows how gender impacted almost every aspect of life in South Carolina—politics, labor, land, and even violence.

Gender roles changed for all Southerners, black, white, male, and female. White masculinity weakened as black men asserted their manhood in ways they never could earlier. Southern white women assumed new responsibilities during the war and were reluctant to let go of their independence; more importantly, they supported their men in their quest to restore white supremacy by any means necessary. Black women, too, wore new hats. They were active in politics by attending rallies, encouraging their men in voting, and sometimes guarding the weapons at mass political meetings. More importantly, black women embraced having more control over their own bodies and children and having a say in decision making that affected their communities.
Klan violence in South Carolina was rampant and often gendered. Blacks and whites who violated the region’s social mores could expect punishment. Gillin makes an important contribution to the literature when she describes “the gendered nature of Klan abuses and the sexual undertones of racial violence” (62). The castration of black men and the rape of black women were attempts to restore order and to reclaim white Southern manhood. According to Gillin, “the Ku Klux Klan was not simply the result of social, political, and economic insecurities on the part of white southerners; it was a response to the diminished power of white manhood, the rise of black manhood, and the changes imposed on the ideals of womanhood by the experiences and actions of black and white women” (62).

Well-researched and well-written, Gillin’s study is an important contribution to women’s history, Southern history, African American history, and the study of racial violence. It is an essential addition to the historiography.

*Florida State University*  
Maxine D. Jones


What can grape vines tell us about American history? The author of this study shows how American imperialism, expansionism, and the cultivation of grapes are intimately intertwined. She argues that “growing grapes was not just a material practice, it was a powerful ideology, set of aesthetics, and ubiquitous discourse of national power” (14). Focused on horticultural history, this book addresses questions of nationalism, placemaking, race, and culture. Biological discourses are analyzed through the lenses of culture, politics, and economics. Based on rich primary sources, ranging from horticultural publications to etchings and novels, this historical account of grape propagation in the United States sheds new light on the concept of American frontierism.

Erica Hannickel’s introduction sets up the main argument that the history of grape cultivation contributes to the history of American nationalism. In chapter 1, she focuses on New York State, the midcentury plant empire of the United States, and grape growing as a classical revival. Hannickel shows how businessmen-horticulturalists cultivated a noble American identity through the propagation of native grapes. This story of vines reveals the tensions between European and American cultures. Nurseryman William Robert Prince’s writings contributed to this vision of *Vitis labrusca* (native American grapes) as a metaphor for the American nation: vigorous, abundant, and resilient.
In chapter 2, Hannickel turns to the role of horticultural literature in spreading information about viticultural techniques and new technologies in the mid-nineteenth century. Grapes were used to tame and civilize the American “wilderness,” but they were also part of “constructing bourgeois urban and national identity” (93).

Early grape entrepreneur Nicholas Longworth is the protagonist of chapter 3, in which the story of American grapes shifts west to Ohio. This chapter shows how entrepreneurs actively used viticulture as a way of masking their land speculation and economic exploitation of labor: “Vineyards functioned as holding spaces for surplus capital, for ennobling and displaying wealth, and for developing other forms of cultural capital” (126).

Questions of race and blood are the focus of chapter 4, “Fear of Hybrid Grapes and Men.” Through an analysis of grape growing in the South, the author shows how racialized discourses of viticulture mirror larger themes such as land ownership and cultural nativism. Through literary sources, Hannickel shows how concerns for the “race” and “breeding” of vines mirrored those of social change in the South.

In the final two chapters, the author looks at the creation of a grape empire and manifest destiny in California. The author argues that the narratives of Californian viticulture were not so different from those used previously in other areas of the United States—racial succession and pastoral elegance dominate the business and literary discourses of California grape growing. The author argues in the final chapter and in the epilogue that the “comparison of vineyards and frontiers, and vintners to cowboys” has continuing cultural resonance because the “contemporary romantic vineyard trope” is mobilized to bridge the gap between nature and culture (195).

Though this book offers a new look at the history of American expansionism through horticulture, its subtitle is misleading. This book does not pay much attention to wine itself; the focus is on viticulture and horticulture more broadly. Nonetheless, the book will be of interest to students of American agricultural history, horticulture enthusiasts, and cultural historians more generally. It would make excellent reading for graduate-level history or American studies classes. The writing is engaging and accessible, making this book appropriate for an audience beyond academia as well.

Rachel E. Black

*Collegium de Lyon, France*

---


In this provocative examination of the emergence of American space policy after World War II, the author argues that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy,
and Johnson shared a goal of allowing the use of space for militarization but not weaponization. He defines militarization as the nonaggressive use of “space-based systems to collect, gather, and disseminate photographic intelligence, communications data, weather data, signals intelligence, and strategic reconnaissance” (5). As such, his argument is essentially a study of the evolution of the policy of using satellites for military purposes while excluding the use of weapons in space and maintaining the nonmilitary exploration of space by all nations. Sean Kalic concludes his analysis in 1967, when the Johnson administration concluded the Outer Space Treaty (OST), which prohibited the placement of weapons of mass destruction in space and guaranteed that space would be open for exploration by all nations.

One of the contributions of this study is that it begins in 1946, rather than the conventional approach of examining the space age as beginning during the Eisenhower administration or with the launch of Sputnik in 1957. Kalic argues that despite President Truman’s lack of interest in space and the cuts he instituted in defense spending during the early years of his presidency, the RAND Corporation conducted theoretical studies on the use of satellites and feasibility studies that included recommendations for the establishment of an Air Force satellite program. Kalic elaborates on the ways in which the Air Force laid claim to military satellite programs, although this claim was not ironclad, nor was it honored by the other services.

The book devotes a chapter each to the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations and a final chapter to summarizing the continuities and variations in the militarization of space from 1946 to 1967 and beyond. Kalic credits Eisenhower with the vision to create a space policy that allowed the pursuit of the militarization of space without allowing the placement of weapons in space. Eisenhower’s decision to create a civilian space agency delineated a separation of civilian and military space programs that his successors did not honor, for both Kennedy and Johnson promoted a national space policy without rigid division of responsibilities. What Kennedy and Johnson did continue, however, was the insistence on militarization but not weaponization. This is not to say that they ignored possible Soviet threats from space, but they countered this possibility with an anti-satellite program (ASAT) and a Ballistic Missile Defense system (BMD). This approach was not without controversy, for the military proposed programs—including Dyna-Soar and the Manned Orbital Laboratory, or MOL—that would have included options for the weaponization of space, but these programs never went into development.

The most significant threat to this policy came from the Soviet Union’s development of a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System (or FOBS, as it was
known in the United States), which sought to evade American early warning radar. In 1962, Kennedy worked with the United Nations, which had proposed a policy banning all military use of space, a policy that the United States did not support. The Soviets eventually abandoned FOBS development. But the United States cooperated in seeking to ban space weapons, and FOBS pushed the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to promote an international agreement, which ultimately became the 1967 Outer Space Treaty.

This is a fine study that adds to our understanding of the evolution of military space policy. Kalic rightly states that this is not intended to be “a comprehensive history of the space age, but rather the history of the ideas and actions that shaped Eisenhower’s, Kennedy’s, and Johnson’s views of the uses of space” (2-3). Even by his own standards, then, there are issues that deserve consideration here that are either given too little attention or overlooked altogether. The study focuses on air force satellite programs and how air force plans, and especially those developed through collaboration with the RAND Corporation, interacted with the evolving national policy on the militarization of space. The army and navy are peripheral players here, and they deserve more attention. The Army Ballistic Missile Agency, the group that included Wernher von Braun and other Germans who were brought to the United States under Project Paperclip, were in the center of the debate, and after all launched the first American satellite, Explorer I. The transfer of this group to NASA was a contentious decision that influenced the civilian-military controversy. In short, missile development was an important part of the discussion alongside satellite development.

University of Alabama in Huntsville

Andrew J. Dunar


In this book the author cheerfully overturns previous reticence about drawing attention to the variety and significance of the influence American Jews have exerted on the production, dissemination, and even definition of so-called “obscenity.” He is hopefully right to believe that the anti-Semitic associations of the past should not bedevil the cultural critics of today. In a series of case studies that combine historical investigation with close readings, Josh Lambert productively explores such topics as the use of obscenity to counter accusations about Jewish sexual deviance, the deployment of literary obscenity as a path
toward literary prestige for some American Jewish authors, the impact of American Jewish lawyers on obscenity case law, the escape from censorship by Yiddish literary production in America, and the self-censorship notable in writing by Jewish authors who claim modesty as a traditional Jewish virtue.

The provocative nature of such topics is self-evident, and Lambert brings a nicely dispassionate tone to his analysis. After reading *Unclean Lips*, no one could deny “the roles played by Jews in the institutional and ideological development of American literature from the late nineteenth century to the present” (23). However, it is less clear how and why Jewishness mattered to all of the players here. Certainly the late twentieth-century authors such as Shmuely Boteach and Wendy Shalit, who proclaim themselves as Orthodox, or at least as traditionally observant, self-consciously steep themselves in Jewish identity in order to denounce the obscenity inherent in modern life and to suggest alternatives. But Lambert is less successful in making such connections for other of his subjects, such as Jewish lawyers Morris Ernst and Harriet Pilpel, who fought to overturn the legal association of contraception and obscenity earlier in the twentieth century. Lambert probably had no way of knowing about scholars’ recent work on the American Jewish community and birth control, since much of it was published at the same time as his book. The reviewer is one of the historians who has worked extensively on the subject, but the relative lack of historical context in some areas weakens his arguments about the role of Jewish identity.

From a literary studies perspective, Lambert succeeds handsomely in drawing connections among disparate events and texts. In one chapter, he deals with publishers (Horace Liveright and Samuel Roth), a novelist (Henry Roth), and graphic novelists (Will Eisner and Jules Feiffer) alike by focusing on the perverse prestige that obscenity could bestow upon literature across the twentieth century. Historians might look somewhat more askance on these connections, which are grounded less on evidence and more in textual analysis and implications. This method, which shapes all of *Unclean Lips*, makes the book an endlessly entertaining read while also leaving some lingering questions about the historical significance of these episodes. Still, there is no doubt that Lambert has written a lively account of a little-known history that deserves a wide audience.

*Rowan University*  
Melissa R. Klapper

Since Eliot Ness pursued Al Capone in the 1930s, the face of organized crime has often been Italian. Mass media has perpetuated the “mafioso” stereotype. Scholars, too, have studied organized crime through the same perspective. In this telling, the Cosa Nostra carried the “family business” to America along with its luggage. Once settled, its “members” quickly resumed their criminal affiliations and activities. In this study, the author aims to create a different narrative. He explores two themes. First, he wants to explore the notion of organized crime as a distinctly Italian enterprise. Although Italians came to control vice operations by the 1950s, for much of Chicago’s history they represented only a small part of the city’s criminal network, which included African American, Irish, Chinese, and Jewish gangsters. Second, he argues that organized crime was not a “family business” handed down through generations but was instead a byproduct of fragmented communities and lack of opportunities.

Chicago offers a promising venue for a tale of organized crime, since vice seems to have been a constant for the city from the beginning. Even the name “Chicago”—a derivation of a Potawatomi word meaning “bad smell,” for the cabbage that grew near waterways—hinted at unsavory activities, and Robert Lombardo takes readers on an informative journey through city neighborhoods. One note: The book cries out for a map. Without reference points for readers with little knowledge of Chicago’s layout, terms like “levee district” and discussion of the first and second wards have little meaning. The story of crime in Chicago begins just after the Civil War, when thousands of migrants—foreign and native-born—were lured to the city by its proximity to shipping and rail lines as well as the emergence of new industries. Vice districts grew along with the town. Tavern owners included Mickey Finn, who gained fame via his practice of slipping powdery substances into patrons’ drinks, rendering them unconscious.

The first crime “boss” Lombardo features was Irish. Michael McDonald owned the largest tavern and gambling house in Chicago. African Americans participated in vice as well, and Lombardo dismisses the notion that blacks stood at the bottom of the city’s criminal hierarchy. Black vice venues proliferated, for example, during Prohibition, since they offered jazz along with their illegal activities to multiethnic crowds. Al Capone emerged during this same era as the first significant Italian crime figure, but he allied with black, Irish, and Jewish vice purveyors until escalating violence tore the coalition apart. At
their peak of power in the 1950s, Italians controlled most vice operations, but their prominence was short-lived, as government officials went after mob figures via wiretaps and prosecutions. Lotteries cut into profits as well, ultimately rendering criminal syndicates somewhat irrelevant.

Organized Crime in Chicago offers readers a revealing glimpse into the larger-than-life personalities that inhabited the netherworld of crime, such as members of “The 42,” a boys’ gang organized in the 1930s by seventh graders. Media glamorization of gangsters may have fueled their participation, and Lombardo might have done more to explore this angle. He also might have compared Chicago to other major American cities, where Italian Americans were a less dominant presence. In Los Angeles, for example, two of the best-known gangsters were Benjamin “Bugsy” Siegel and Mickey Cohen.

California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo

Kathleen A. Cairns

A Lenape among the Quakers: The Life of Hannah Freeman. By Dawn G. Marsh. (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2014. Pp. xii, 211. $27.95.)

Communities of Lenape (or Delaware) peoples inhabited present-day Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and southern New York for millennia prior to European colonization in the seventeenth century. An Algonquian-speaking people with a matrilineal kinship system, the Lenapes pursued a mixed economy based on agriculture, hunting, and fishing, often residing along major rivers and their tributaries. As was the case with virtually all native peoples, the Lenapes came under increased pressure to adapt their life ways in response to the burgeoning French and English colonization. Frequently, warfare was the product of this collision of native and European cultures. In Pennsylvania, however, the “peaceable kingdom” of William Penn sought to avoid violence and its inevitable costs by offering more rational and humane Indian policies. The short- and long-term effects of these policies on the Lenapes provide the context for Dawn Marsh’s examination of the life of Hannah Freeman [1720s-1802], a Lenape woman who spent the bulk of her life residing along the Brandywine River in southeastern Pennsylvania. By telling “Indian Hannah’s” story, Marsh seeks to shed light on an individual marginalized in colonial Pennsylvania histories and to revise traditional assessments of the Quakers’ “peaceable kingdom.”

A key theme running throughout the work is the author’s contention that Hannah Freeman remained true to her Lenape identity and homeland. She farmed, raised livestock, wove baskets and cloth, and, drawing on her
knowledge of traditional medicines, served as a healer for her Lenape and Quaker neighbors. She apparently never accepted the religious tenets of the Society of Friends. That said, there is evidence that she was certainly adaptive and did what was necessary to maintain her independence. She worked for local Quaker farmers as a wage laborer, supplemented her income by selling handcrafts in local markets, wore Quaker-style clothing, lived in a cabin, and spoke English. The author interprets these adaptations as proof of her tenacious desire to remain Lenape (resilience and adaptability being fundamental elements of Lenape culture). Curiously, there is no mention of Hannah ever getting married.

A second key theme is the attitudes and behaviors of Freeman’s Quaker neighbors and their “schizophrenic” conduct in regards to the rapidly shrinking population of Brandywine Lenapes. On the one hand, Quaker leaders were intent on living up to the relatively fair-minded policies of William Penn that called for peaceful relations with Native Americans, land purchases (rather than seizures), and equal justice for Indian victims of crime. On the other hand, Quaker farmers and merchants were eager to vacate Lenape claims to the fertile farmlands of southeastern Pennsylvania and, like their non-Quaker countrymen, were unwilling to allow a small number of Indians to stand in the path of “progress.” Marsh provides a strong case that colonial officials ignored provisions in a 1683 treaty negotiated by William Penn that guaranteed the Lenapes’ lands on either side of the Brandywine River.

Marsh makes commendable use of the scant documentary evidence to piece together Hannah Freeman’s life. Her painstaking efforts to give Hannah a voice are impressive—although she acknowledges that a good deal is simply speculation. On a negative note, the book has no index and there are a few lapses in editing (e.g., two references to the Indian Removal Act of 1832—it should be 1830). These problems should not detract from an interesting book that expands our knowledge about the history of the indigenous peoples of colonial Pennsylvania.

University of Texas at Brownsville

Thomas A. Britten


The author of this study has written a well-researched analysis of the Confederate government’s policy of slave impressment in Virginia and North Carolina
during the Civil War. Countering numerous other historical studies on the Confederacy that argue that slave impressment failed and was indicative of systemic internal dysfunction, Jaime Amanda Martinez contends that the policy was highly successful and demonstrated Confederate strength. She does this by emphasizing the coordinated efforts of local, state, and national governments to fulfill slave impressment quotas. Despite significant slaveholder opposition, impressment quotas were adequately filled, and tens of thousands of African American slaves were put to work building the South’s defensive fortifications against the Union. As Martinez concludes, “through slave impressment, slaves, slaveholders, and government officials all worked to defend the Confederate state” (164). In fact, according to Martinez, the Confederacy would have collapsed well before 1865 had it not been for the impressed slaves.

Not only did effective Confederate impressment policy sustain the Southern cause against mounting Northern aggression, it also led to black freedom. “Slave labor on the Confederate fortifications served as the justification for the US Confiscation Acts, which,” Martinez posits, “paved the way toward the Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment” (17). Additionally, the sustained policy of Confederate slave impressment brought the Confederacy to the verge of arming slaves and enlisting them into the army. According to Martinez, the Confederacy considered this action not as “the last gasp of a dying nation” but “as a long-term plan for victory” (152). These “Black Confederates,” as she calls them, would have been repaid for their service with emancipation had they been called to arms. So in sum: (1) the success of Confederate slave impressment policy demonstrated the efficacy of Confederate federalism; (2) large numbers of African American slaves defended and sustained the Confederate cause against overwhelming Northern force; and (3) eventual black freedom proved the result of Confederate policy.

Such conclusions are befuddling and profoundly problematic. Martinez seems to be looking for agency in all the wrong places, and yet this is what must happen when historians attempt to write multicultural histories of Confederate nationalism. When sent on a quest to discover the contributions that African Americans made to the Confederate cause, one cannot be allowed to entertain the fact that finding black agency in support of a white supremacist, slaveholding nation-state might be problematic. The thought that armed “Black Confederates” might turn and kill those white Confederates who just armed them would never even enter the mind. Ultimately, even Martinez seems to have become aware of the potential criticism that awaited her book. In her final and shortest chapter, Martinez tries to preempt future critics by
attempting to distance herself from advocates of the “Lost Cause.” Yet the weight of her previous five chapters overwhelms the last, crushing it and leaving only the false impression that Southern slaves worked (and would have fought) hard to defend a breakaway Confederacy that went to war to preserve and spread racial slavery. It doesn’t figure.

Keene State College Matthew H. Crocker


Slavery was at the heart of the Lincoln-Douglas debates during the Illinois Senate race of 1858 but so was territorial expansion into Latin America and the Caribbean, as the author of this book persuasively argues. Robert E. May is the author of several widely read studies of Southern imperial designs in the antebellum era, including _The Southern Dream of a Caribbean Empire_ [1973]. In this engaging new book, he takes up the theme again to show how plans for conquest in the tropics, which for slave holders and the Democratic Party was the condition of US slavery’s survival and growth, shaped the divergence between the two great Illinois foes from the 1840s through the Civil War and slave emancipation.

Douglas seems to have left a much greater paper trail than Lincoln, so his support for expansion is more clearly elucidated than is Lincoln’s opposition, though the future president was a visible opponent of the Mexican-American War [1846–1848] and a critic of the Polk administration’s designs on Mexican territory. Douglas, an advocate of war and a supporter of the Southern filibusters who proposed to capture Caribbean and Central American territories for slavery in the 1840s and 1850s, eventually found himself in an untenable position as a national political leader. He supported popular sovereignty in new territories like Kansas so that the voters could decide whether to enter the Union as free or slave states. Yet this attempted compromise with slave interests was not enough, as the Southern states came to demand formal federal protection for the expansion of slavery, not only in newly acquired territories but also in those for which they hungered in the Caribbean, such as Cuba, and in Latin America, such as William Walker’s short-lived Nicaragua regime. His rivals gloated over the Little Giant’s impossible position as a supporter of both popular sovereignty and imperial expansion. President Buchanan observed that:
“Douglas has alienated the South on the Kansas question & the North upon the Filibuster question” (144).

Lincoln was always opposed to conquest and the spread of slavery, but as May shows in the final chapter, he was also always interested in the spread of US freedom in the tropics through the voluntary colonization of freed blacks. As president, he clung to the belief that colonization was the necessary counterpart to emancipation; even after the Emancipation Proclamation, he supported schemes for settlement in Gran Colombia and the small Haitian island of Île-à-Vache. Latin American commitment to territorial sovereignty and African American rejection of emigration finally led him to embrace citizenship at home as emancipation’s outcome. Thus did the tropics come to figure into the complex politics of slavery and freedom in the United States.

Historians of Latin America and the Caribbean will learn much about US ambitions in this era and, thanks to May, find important comparative questions about the links between slavery and territorial sovereignty, a fraught issue not limited to the Northern republic.

Tufts University

Christopher Schmidt-Nowara


If the Revolutionary War general Charles Lee is remembered today, it is as an egomaniacal eccentric who was famously confronted by General George Washington during the Battle of Monmouth in June 1778. Yet few Americans realize that Leetown, West Virginia; Lee, Massachusetts; and Fort Lee on the New Jersey side of the George Washington Bridge are all named for him. Recently, there has been an upsurge of both popular and scholarly interest in Charles Lee; he has been depicted as a scandalous, conniving personality on the AMC television series TURN, appears as the primary antagonist in the popular video game Assassin’s Creed III, and is the subject of three new studies, one of which is Dominick Mazzagetti’s Charles Lee: Self Before Country.

Lee was born in Cheshire, England, the youngest of seven children, to Colonel John Lee and his wife Isabella (Bunbury) Lee. He enlisted as an ensign in his father’s regiment, the 44th Regiment of Foot, in his early teens. He was a veteran of the French and Indian War as well as conflicts in Eastern Europe and became a vocal critic of King George III and an advocate of American resistance to British imperial policies in the late 1760s and early 1770s.
Dismayed at being passed over for a military promotion and disillusioned with a monarch who he believed was leading England toward tyranny, Lee left for America, arriving in New York City in 1773. He immediately took up his pen in support of the American cause, encouraging their resistance to British imperial policies and calling for independence. Lee’s advocacy for America as well as his impressive intellect, cosmopolitanism, military skills, and combat experience earned him respect from his American contemporaries.

In June 1775, the Continental Congress gave Lee a commission in the Continental Army as a major general, and he soon became second-in-command to George Washington. Lee eventually helped organize the Continental lines around Boston in 1775–1776; designed the defenses for New York City in early 1776; was appointed commander of the Southern Department of the Continental Army; and helped to strengthen the defenses of Charleston, South Carolina, and oversee its successful defense against a British attack in the summer of 1776. Lee’s successes earned him great praise from several leading revolutionaries and, by the early fall of 1776, he was considered a potential replacement for George Washington as commander in chief. However, Lee was captured by British dragoons at an isolated tavern in Basking Ridge, New Jersey, on 13 December 1776, which ended this possibility and began his path to infamy.

Mazzagetti’s focus is, as the title suggests, Lee’s self-serving behavior throughout his career in the British military and later in the Continental army. Mazzagetti presents Lee as the consummate opportunist who sought fame and notoriety wherever and whenever possible. “Did he [Lee] sail to New York City in 1773 to personally assist the Americans in their struggle for liberty against the tyranny of George III?” Mazzagetti rhetorically asks. He answers,

I do not think so. Although an outspoken critic of the Crown and an early supporter of American causes, it appears more likely that Charles Lee stumbled into the American cause in 1773 at the tail end of his meaningless travels throughout Europe and quickly realized that it could serve his ambition and ego. (xi)

Reacting to earlier historians who “offer alternative views and explanations in an attempt to rehabilitate Charles Lee,” Mazzagetti contends that Lee “deserves credit for his contributions to the American cause,” yet he “lacked the moral strength necessary for a commitment to any cause other than his own, or to any person who did not share his opinion of his own worth” (x-xi).

At the center of Mazzagetti’s book is “Mr. Lee’s Plan,” a document authored by Lee in March 1777 while in British captivity and discovered eighty
years later among the papers of Sir Henry Strachey, the secretary for Sir William Howe, and his brother, Lord Admiral Richard Howe, in their capacity as royal peace commissioners. The author never doubts that “Mr. Lee’s Plan” proves Lee’s intrigue and probably treason to the Revolution. He acknowledges that “most historians have reluctantly come to the conclusion that Charles Lee did indeed author this document,” yet he emphatically takes to task those who “ascribe good motives to Lee” for writing it (141). Although Mazzagetti does raise the possibility that, under the circumstances, Lee might have tried to ingratiate himself to his British captors, he summarily dismisses this option. Yet there were several Americans (Ethan Allen comes to mind) who, either from concerns for self-preservation or to achieve a certain goal, played both sides against the middle. For Mazzagetti, there is no grey area; “whatever Lee’s motives and misgivings … the plan cannot be read as anything other than a betrayal” (144).

This work is well written and clearly argued. The book’s organization is not strictly chronological but more thematic. It opens in June 1775 at the moment when the Continental Congress chose George Washington over several candidates, including Charles Lee, to command its army against the British. Lee was a brilliant yet flawed person, and questions about his moral character and eccentric behavior have dominated the literature about him from the Revolution to the present. Mazzagetti’s account of Lee’s life continues this interpretative trend.

Union County College
Phillip Papas


This study is the most recent effort to expand the scope of military history, particularly that pertaining to the Civil War, to include many of the factors and considerations related to the natural environment. Joining the exciting trend initiated by Lisa Brady, Megan Nelson, Edmund Russell, and others, author Kathryn Meier focuses her approach on an even more specific emphasis: health and the common soldier. Though *Nature’s Civil War* is a very limited microhistory, Meier’s work will prove a template for other scholars and could, very likely, inspire an entire genre within Civil War studies.

Meier seeks to expand “common soldier scholarship” by exploring the ways in which Union and Confederate soldiers provided “self care” in an effort to
survive and avoid disease. As she explains: “Scholars have long suspected that Civil War common soldiers faced tremendous odds against remaining well, but it appears the scattered official statistics that remain have scarcely done the soldier’s plight justice” (6). In order to expand our understanding, Meier’s account emphasizes “anecdotal” evidence. Based on this evidence, Nature’s Civil War establishes “a far sicker and demoralized soldier population than often portrayed in the literature” (7).

One of the great strengths of Meier’s work is the creation of a basic formula for organizing the soldier’s experience. She lays out this formula while also considering the impact of hunger, disease, and basic human functions. In doing so, she has laid the groundwork for scholars to utilize this template to study the experience of any soldier population for which sources, such as diaries and other written accounts, are available. Therefore, her greatest success might be the application of elements of environmental history—primarily the impact of nature on human health—to the experience of the Civil War. In particular, she sets her goal as “drawing soldiers into the conversation regarding their own health” (8–9).

As Meier readily admits, though, this is only a case study. Approaching her work much like a scientist, she selectively chooses two campaigns for their contrasting environments: one a swampy hotbed of disease and the other almost pastoral. By design, Nature’s Civil War sets out to break the habit of divorcing soldiers’ mental and physical health (13). Thus, this carefully constructed portrait of the “miserable business” of war at the level of the common soldier is a great success even if it is a selective study.

Meier documents all of this with extensive use of primary and secondary sources to create a valuable contribution to the literature on the campaigns of 1862. It will interest any reader of history, particularly those with an interest in the intersection between the Civil War and medicine, the environment, and the health of the common soldier.

In addition to creating a template for other scholars to use, Meier initiates consideration of the official struggles of Union and Confederate medical hierarchies to craft efficient medical departments. There is great room for further development of this and many other points that Meier touches upon. Though not an authoritative work, Nature’s Civil War will intrigue and inspire scholars to advance new approaches to studying the Civil War.

Penn State, Altoona

Brian Black
Word of Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer’s death at the Battle of the Little Bighorn on 25 June 1876, reached most Americans right after the republic marked the one hundredth anniversary of its independence. Long accustomed to trading in sensation, American newspapers jumped on the story with the hound-like frenzy of a hunting pack. Readers regarded Custer as the most dashing Northern cavalryman to emerge from the Civil War, and most ranked him as the country’s greatest Indian fighter. The very idea that such a hero had been massacred with every soldier under his immediate command filled his shocked countrymen with horror and anger.

Historians of the Little Bighorn are fond of quoting many of the hysterical headlines that announced Custer’s fall. Dwelling on the fact that 1876 was a presidential election year, they opine that politics permeated the Custer fight with an extra resonance that kept it in the forefront of the news. Democratic papers exploited the disaster to criticize President Ulysses S. Grant’s Indian policy. Republican outlets defended Grant and tried to fix the onus for the defeat on Custer, a Democrat who had criticized the administration’s handling of frontier affairs. This and other controversies generated by the Custer fight shaped its image in the public mind and elevated it to the realm of myth.

In this new study, James E. Mueller, a journalism professor, provides a deeply researched and eloquently phrased examination of the actual impact that the Custer massacre had on the Fourth Estate. Initially, Mueller reveals, most newspapers accorded the Great Sioux War of 1876 little coverage. All that changed with the clash at the Little Bighorn. Custer’s celebrity status and the totality of his defeat made the event big news. It also provided partisan papers with the opportunity for a round of partisan backbiting, but that did not last for long. Even those newspapers that faulted Custer’s conduct of his final battle still regarded him as a hero. Although many editors had questioned the morality of the Sioux War, Custer’s death caused them to unite in demanding that the hostile Indians who had vanquished him be chastised and driven back to their reservations.

The murder of four politically prominent African Americans by white Democrats in Hamburg, Georgia, on 8 July 1876, drove the Little Bighorn from the front pages and soon eclipsed it as a political issue. The press would run additional stories about Custer’s Last Stand in the coming months, but the Little
Bighorn developed more into a human interest story than a political rallying point.

Mueller’s book delivers much more than can be mentioned in a concise review. This is a rich addition to the better scholarly literature devoted to the Custer myth. Mueller succeeds in disproving a number of baseless generalizations that have long masqueraded as fact, and he replaces them with a judicious account of what newspaper editors chose to emphasize in the second half of America’s centennial year.

Gregory J. W. Urwin

Temple University


The author’s engaging introduction to women’s lives and gender norms in colonial Brazil draws on a wealth of secondary sources in English and Portuguese as well as documentation she uncovered through her own archival research. This beautifully written book will be useful as an introductory survey for students and a rich source of bibliography for specialists. Its six chapters treat early colonial images of native women (as Amazons and cannibals); ideal Christian womanhood; women’s education; marriage and concubinage; female religious institutions; and women’s use of magic, sorcery, and witchcraft.

Carole Myscofski succeeds best in demonstrating the myriad ways in which male colonial elites sought to circumscribe sharply women’s lives. Readers familiar with the history of Spanish America will recognize the gender norms that trapped women of all classes and races (if in different ways) in an interlocking web of constraining religious norms, imperial laws, social expectations, and familial interests. The Brazilian case differs in several regards, however. Located far from the densely populated, hierarchical native civilizations of central Mexico and Peru, Brazilian religious and secular authorities grew frustrated with the shortcomings of their efforts to monitor native women’s physical bodies and thoughts in order to ensure conformity to Iberian notions of “honor.” White women were so few and resources so scarce until the late seventeenth century that the Portuguese imperial government forbade the establishment of Brazil’s first nunnery until 1677, permitting only four recolhimentos (cloistered residences) during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in which women of various ranks might seek shelter or escape from marriage—if not an escape from disciplinary control.
Less successful is the author’s attempt to “provide the foundation for women’s own history, for the expression of how women experienced and understood their own lives within and against their political and religious constraints” (2). Scarce and highly biased documentation severely limits what we can know about “how women [of colonial Brazil] experienced and understood their own lives.” Even in the rare cases when (mostly white) women’s words were captured in writing (for example, when they petitioned for entrance into a convent or confessed to an inquisitor), the context, purpose, and intended audience of this writing can render “women’s perspective[s]” opaque. Chapter 4 concludes (unpersuasively) that in early nineteenth-century Vila Rica, Minas Gerais (and by inference, elsewhere), “many [women] lived successfully at the edges of the [Christian] ideal [of marriage], and many more thrived just beyond its reach” (142). Highlighting cases of women who resisted social restrictions, Myscofski provides far more evidence of the daunting challenges all women faced than she does glimpses of independent women who “thrived beyond [the] reach” of conjugal ties—whether formal or informal.

The author’s focus on three centuries of colonial history—although it sacrifices some depth of analysis of particular cases—allows her to make an important case that control of women was at the heart of colonial exploitation. Reversing the consensus among the male colonial elite that disorderly women were both a sign and a cause of social chaos, Myscofski condemns misogyny (a word used liberally in the text) as the key pillar of hierarchies of race, class, and gender as well as the basis for exploitation of the peoples and land of Brazil.

City College, CUNY

Susan K. Besse


In this study, the author examines eight well-known conflicts that erupted between Native American societies and the United States during the first century of the latter’s existence. In his attempt to find a common theme amongst the origins of these so-called Indian Wars, Roger L. Nichols concludes that Americans held most of the blame, not the indigenous peoples whom they often depicted as uncivilized savages. Despite the fact that history all too often recorded the start of each event with a native attack, Americans’ fervent expansion across North America, in order to fulfill their self-proclaimed “manifest destiny,” pushed Native Americans to violence against their new neighbors.
These Native American refusals to acculturate to Western mores conflicted with and promoted fear amongst white settlers, whose local concerns often outweighed any allegiance to the federal union.

Nichols presents his analysis in eight chronological chapters. From the Ohio Valley in the 1790s to the Nez Perce War following the American Civil War, he tries to show the similarities among the origins of each conflict while recognizing the inherent uniqueness of each native society involved. As Nichols aptly demonstrates, wars between the United States and the Indian peoples of North America happened as a result of “Indian initiatives” undertaken as a response to “local pioneer actions” (8). The author teases out the underlying factors that reveal native violence in these instances as a last-ditch attempt to stave off fundamental change to their cultures and societies. In fact, the violence visited upon their new white neighbors often resulted from frustration at the strife their presence had created among native communities. As native leaders competed to fit their new American neighbors into their world, they often came into conflict with each other. Eventually, the frustration would spill over to include the American newcomers in the violence, whose own militaristic society would respond in kind, resulting in the so-called Indian Wars of the nineteenth-century American West.

The author’s conclusions will not surprise specialists, and he could have done more to show the divided nature of American society during this century, thereby providing equal analysis concerning the social, cultural, and political underpinnings of his two opposing cultural groups. Although Nichols makes an important point in recognizing the role individual states played in the eventual removal of the southeastern tribes, he misses a real opportunity to delve into how the federal-state dynamic influenced this process. These minor complaints aside, Nichols has presented a complex topic in an easily digestible format. His attempt to reach a broad audience combined with his willingness to acknowledge the contradictions and ambiguities between the causes of these wars is commendable, especially given the brevity of the book. Warrior Nations deserves consideration for use in any undergraduate survey of Native American history or nineteenth-century expansion. Further, budding historians should consider this collection of case studies as a worthy jumping-off point from which to embark on a career in US-Indian and frontier relations.

Lake Ridge, Virginia

Daniel Flaherty
A half century ago, historian Malcolm McMillan published *The Alabama Confederate Reader*. McMillan’s collection paid no attention to race or gender and barely touched upon Reconstruction, focused as it was on battles and generals. Since then, a seismic shift has taken place within Civil War historiography, so an update was long overdue. Thankfully, respected scholar Kenneth Noe succeeds admirably in pulling together fourteen essays that trace the conflict from the election of 1860 to late-Reconstruction black churches. *The Yellowhammer War*—a name derived from the similarity between the state’s yellow woodpeckers and buttery-trimmed uniforms worn by the 4th Alabama Cavalry—should long stand as the most complete account of Alabama during those turbulent years.

All of the essays collected in this volume are solid, but two are especially revelatory. Harriet Doss chronicles the reaction of white and black Alabamans to the news of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination. Although a few whites rejoiced, others feared that Andrew Johnson would prove to be far harder on them than the martyred president. Freed slaves understood that their former masters loathed the Illinois Republican, and they grasped the connection between their liberation and Lincoln’s policies. Too many writers continue to ignore the fact that “southerner” has always been a biracial term, yet Alabama’s memory of the war and the emergence of a “Lost Cause” mythology, Doss astutely observes, was never uniform and invariably divided along racial lines.

Prolific historian Michael Fitzgerald’s equally fascinating essay examines the wartime origins of post-conflict white Unionism. Previous scholars have written of white disaffection with such Confederate policies as the draft and crop confiscation, but Fitzgerald moves beyond broad generalizations to provide a detailed picture of future Republicans. White Unionists tended to be middling farmers rather than the poorest agriculturalists, he notes, although a good number of postwar Republicans “had much less property on average than most white Alabamans and many fewer slaves” (227). Perhaps the most surprising thing about this group was their courage in defending the Union and denouncing the slaveholders’ republic. Of the 111 Republicans that Fitzgerald studied, roughly half were verbally threatened with lethal violence, and 27 were menaced by proposed lynching. Once US soldiers arrived, however, life improved
for these men and women. These white Republicans, however, did not exhibit progressive thought on race, Fitzgerald adds. If they became critics of slavery, it was only because they blamed their wealthy Democratic neighbors for starting a war that devastated their state.

The one essay that reads a bit like a throwback to an earlier historiography is Ben Severance’s chapter on the 1863 Battle of Salem Church. In his conclusion, Severance explains a Confederate officer’s claim that he was not fighting from “any wicked desire to destroy American liberties” by suggesting that “present-day attitudes might consider this last remark a soft-pedaling of slavery” (68). As the essays by Doss and Fitzgerald indicate, a good many black and white Alabamans from the 1860s, and not just modern readers, might suspect it was exactly that.

Le Moyne College

Douglas R. Egerton


This new, partial biography of Douglas MacArthur has a couple of interesting points, but it generally leaves much to be desired. Given the miserliness of its commercial publisher, there are no notes or bibliography. There is instead only a three-page “Notes on Sources” in which the author acknowledges previous MacArthur biographers, such as D. Clayton James, William Manchester, and Geoffrey Perret, as “contributors” rather than originators, and he does not include Edward Drea and Richard Frank in this extraordinarily limited list of sources. Along these lines, author Mark Perry at times offers material as original when that is questionable. The lack of source documentation, for example, leaves the reader at sea when it comes to the author’s claim that MacArthur was some sort of strategic visionary concerning interwar combined arms and combined service operational doctrine.

Another significant problem is that the title of the book indicates that a major theme of the study is to analyze MacArthur as some sort of American demagogue. Perry, however, introduces this theme in the first chapter but then leaves it unexplored until the last chapter. What the reader is left with is a fairly average and already-told story about MacArthur’s Pacific War and the idea that FDR somehow allegedly tamed MacArthur politically during the war. Again, if any of this is new, it will be very difficult for readers to figure it out given the lack of source documentation.
A further limitation is the very poorly done research on details about the war. For instance, the author mixes up General Hideki Tojo and Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto in their statements about the coming war with the United States; has Saburo Sakai as the Japanese fighter commander of the force bombing the Philippines on 8 December 1941 when, in fact, he was a flight petty officer in that command; and refers to the Battle of the Eastern Solomons in August 1942 as a night battle when it was actually a daylight carrier engagement. These may be “picky” details, but they bring into question the research Perry did. The book is also poorly edited, no doubt the result of Basic Books cutting its editorial staff. For instance, Vice Admiral Thomas Kinkaid’s name is at times correctly spelled and at other times appears as “Kincaid.”

Poor decisions made by the author or by Basic Books, doubtless for purposes of profit, again illustrate that with so much of historical publishing unfortunately becoming commercial, the trend of omitting citations and neglecting editing is only going to harm the scholarly study of history by both academics and the general public. In this case, if the author had original findings, they were sadly buried in research already done by other scholars. In that regard, Perry has been very poorly served by either his publisher or his own conception of historical scholarship.

Henry Ford College


This provocative study adds significant new information to a growing literature that explores what broadly has been called the “dirty details” or “underbelly” of American GIs’ behavior in the European theater of operations during World War II. Mary Louise Roberts uses oral histories, memoirs, archival sources—some only recently opened in 2005—periodicals, and the soldiers’ newspaper Stars and Stripes to explore and interpret the GIs’ sexual activities in France. Though not the first study to focus on this topic, the book concentrates on the notion that the ways in which sexual relations between French females and GIs were managed is central to an overall understanding of how the United States and France negotiated authority between themselves. By using a cultural and gender-based analysis, the book is organized around three sections (“Romance,” “Prostitution,” and “Rape”); overall, Roberts presents a stark contrast to the well-worn “good war” and “greatest generation” narratives.
A central thesis of Roberts’s book is that during the time the United States was in France, both nations were experiencing major transitions. The United States, she observes, was taking on the mantle of global power while France was coming to grips with its many losses, including its 1940 defeat by Germany and the humiliating occupation that followed. According to Roberts, sexual relations gained political significance during this time because the entire command structure and administration of the US military viewed the French as morally degraded. Officers believed that if the French were unable to control female responses to GIs’ advances, they were unlikely to be capable of governing themselves after the war.

The basis for such opinion was grounded in part in the myths of France carried home by American soldiers from World War I who adopted the view that France was a land of wine, women, and song. A generation later, such ideas had become so deeply embedded in the minds of Americans that some of their journalists described France as one tremendous brothel. Roberts argues that military propagandists played on this eroticized image of France to encourage GIs to enlist and fight. Soon after D-Day, struggles between the US and French officials over sex—which brothels to close, how to control streetwalkers and manage venereal disease—according to Roberts, came to possess larger political meanings over dominance and submission that defined not only the Normandy campaign itself but Franco-American relations after the war.

Though Roberts’s arguments are appealing—even seductive—they rest largely on how much credence to give claims grounded in the language and methods of symbolic political analysis. So much of it rests on the interpretations given to the archival materials that readers might wonder about the scope and size of the archival holdings the author used and what proportion of the material she examined did not support such a gendered analysis. This question also stems from the overreaching language that Roberts employs to make her argument convincing. “At all levels of military command, officials shared the prejudice that the French were morally degraded” is an example of such language, as is “because the US military [all of it?] equated France with libidinal satisfaction, sex became integral to how it construed the Normandy campaign” (7).

Readers might also be puzzled by the argument that US soldiers who had fought in Italy found solace in whoring in Le Havre at the end of the war, because Roberts does not make clear why these soldiers were in Le Havre in the first place or what percentage of those who had already fought in the Mediterranean theater of war (Italy) also fought through France and Germany (99). In addition, whilst there is no doubt that black US soldiers disproportionately
received harsher punishments for sexual offenses than white GIs, Roberts offers no proof—not even one name—that any innocent black soldiers were executed (257). These quibbles aside, this is an important and groundbreaking book.

Northern Kentucky University

J. Robert Lilly


Long before Barack Obama and Martin Luther King Jr. were accused of being secret socialists, Peter H. Clark became the first African American involved in the socialist movement. Nikki M. Taylor’s new biography follows the life of this educator and activist from his earliest years in antebellum Cincinnati to his death after World War I. Although he has been largely forgotten by the general public and most historians have focused on his socialist activity, Taylor shows how Clark’s involvement in many different political movements, even in ways that seemed, and still seem, contradictory, was central in “African American political strivings and intellectual life in the nineteenth century” (12).

Clark lived a life of ideas, activism, and politics, and so Taylor appropriately studies that life within the broader context of nineteenth-century intellectual, political, and social history. Although he was born into a free and prominent family, he found his upward mobility constantly challenged by racism; for instance, he ended a brief barbering career when a white customer asked for his help in gaining sexual access to black women. He was also exposed to a wide range of ideas such as black nationalism, German American labor activism, and Unitarianism. His support for black institutions, education, and equal rights resulted in a half-century of service as a teacher and principal in black schools. Clark was also active in the antislavery struggle, and after the Civil War he became the first African American active in socialist politics. In later years, though, his political influence among black voters, and thus his usefulness to white politicians, faded as he seemed increasingly willing to support whatever political party would offer him a patronage position, even defending Democratic officials who had arrested black men to keep them from voting. He spent the last few decades of his life in the obscurity that has lasted to the present day.

In *America’s First Black Socialist*, Taylor excellently traces the various ideological threads that influenced and were influenced by Peter H. Clark
throughout his long life, thus showing why he matters in our conception of nineteenth-century black political and intellectual history. She also enhances our understanding of the importance of pre-Great Migration black Midwestern history, which has often been overshadowed by later events and by Southern history during the same time. The book also strongly reflects Taylor’s own views about Clark’s actions and ideas. Her analysis may be overly defensive of his early years and overly critical of his later years: phrases like “loss of conscience and commitment toward his people” are typical (157). This may raise broader questions about whether biographers should defend their subject, criticize their subject, or explore and contextualize their subject, leaving explicit defense and criticism to the reader. Otherwise, though, this is a fine study of an inappropriately forgotten black leader, useful to any reader who wants to better understand nineteenth-century black Midwestern history; black intellectual, educational, and political history; and the connections between African Americans and radical white thinkers.

Trinity Christian College

David Brodnax Sr.


The title of this study suggests its ambitious scope. One of the challenges of broadly discussing a slave society is successfully integrating the diverse white and black experiences during what the author suggests was actually a civil war pitting Republican against Whig and black against white. Alan Taylor achieves success deftly as he argues that the social unraveling, slaveholder fears, and destruction of property during the War of 1812 convinced white Virginians that the Union could not be relied upon to serve their interests.

The Internal Enemy is divided into thematic chapters that proceed in a predominantly chronological fashion. Accordingly, Taylor begins by describing eighteenth-century white Virginians, who are seemingly hopeful, ambitious, and nervous in equal degrees. Ambitious to increase their wealth through slavery, they simultaneously feared being overwhelmed by blacks and the threat of rebellion from their human property. This understanding of eighteenth-century Virginian slaveholders as anxious about the unsteady foundations on which their futures were built is not new. Historians such as Benjamin Quarles, Sylvia Frey, and Woody Holton have effectively established that slave owners’ fears of the marginalized had a hand in guiding Virginia’s ship of state. However, The
*Internal Enemy* appears to be written for a nonacademic audience, so the inclusion of the revolutionary era may be a necessary preface to his primary sphere, the early nineteenth century.

As Taylor discusses the Chesapeake from 1812 to 1814, he adeptly illuminates Virginians’ struggle in a region destabilized by an internal war and a simultaneous conflict against the English. Virginians of both races thrust the role of slave emancipators on the English long before the English embraced it themselves. The association of the enemy with emancipation reinforced white Virginians’ perception that the defense of slavery was fundamental to a worthwhile American union. The English Chesapeake campaign of 1814 solidified white Virginians’ understanding that the Union lacked both the will and the wherewithal to protect their property. Slaves played a significant role in this process. Taylor is particularly effective in describing the chaos as slaves fled to the British and aided them as sailors, guides, spies, thieves, and liberators. White fear of rebellion in the midst of the disorder exacerbated Virginians’ resentment against an ineffectual Union.

Taylor compellingly presents his nonacademic audience with a chaotic and unstable world created by the fears, experiences, and aspirations of both white and black Virginians. In doing so, Taylor offers a very convincing picture of the War of 1812 as a civil war, which convinced white Virginians, both wealthy and yeoman, that the defense of slavery and its diffusion were linchpins of Virginian patriotism. Northern efforts to restrict the spread of slavery westward following the war underscored the lessons Virginians learned during the war. The Union proved to white Virginians of all classes that it was an unworthy vessel to carry Virginians’ fears and aspirations. Thus, the seeds of secession were sown.

*University of South Carolina*  
Carter Bruns


The author of this book is a talented and prolific legal analyst and historian. *In the Balance* offers his analysis of the relationship between law and politics in the decisions of the Roberts Court. Mark Tushnet holds a number of views that most would find unsurprising for a professor of law at Harvard University. He does not much like Republicans, a distaste that can at times descend into partisan carping and the occasional cheap shot or ad hominem attack.
Tushnet begins his analysis of the Roberts Court by examining the process of appointment. He argues that Republicans tend to look for ideological credentials in potential nominees to the Supreme Court and that Democrats employ a “demographic strategy,” meaning that their nominees represent ethnic, racial, or gender groups important to the party (24). Perhaps Democrats can safely pursue a demographic strategy because such nominees are likely to be and have proven to be dependably liberal.

The book is an extended criticism of Chief Justice John Roberts’s “umpire” metaphor in particular and conservative jurisprudence in general. In his confirmation hearing, Roberts compared the decisions of the Supreme Court to the role of an umpire in calling balls and strikes. Tushnet remains unpersuaded by Roberts’s approach to constitutional adjudication. He is considerably more sympathetic to that of Justice Elena Kagan, a former professor and dean at Harvard Law School, whom Tushnet sees as an emerging leader of the liberal justices as well as a worthy adversary of Roberts.

The author begins with President Barack Obama’s unoriginal observation that 95 percent of cases are easy. The other 5 percent are the significant ones. In those cases, the author argues, politics becomes a “critical ingredient” in the decision. By politics, he does not mean “the everyday partisan politics of Capitol Hill, but a politics of principle” (xi). Thus, in evaluating the performance of the court, Tushnet argues that one should take legal arguments seriously—but not too seriously. The author maintains that analysts should examine the larger constitutional philosophies of the justices, which he characterizes as “capacious ways of thinking about problems,” rather than narrow political ideologies (xvi). He concludes that the Roberts Court is not reliably conservative in the sense of supporting current positions of the Republican Party; yet, in general, the Roberts Court supports constitutional positions associated with the Republican Party of the early twenty-first century.

Tushnet is good at dissecting conservative theories of jurisprudence, often using the classroom techniques of a law professor to hold them up to ridicule. His attacks, however, are not always fair. For example, he attacks as “inconsistent” critics of Obama’s commitment to choose judges who would feel empathy with minority or poor litigants. These critics accuse Obama’s standard of being selective, in that he looks for judges empathetic with poor people but not with small business people. At the same time, critics attack such an approach for having no basis in law. These two criticisms are not contradictory, something that Tushnet admits two pages later (77, 79). While he acknowledges on occasion that one may find similar problems with liberal
theories of jurisprudence, Tushnet spends considerably less time and energy doing so.

Under Roberts, the court has decided unanimously a higher percentage of cases than it has for decades. Tushnet points out that this does not mean that the justices agree on larger constitutional issues. Rather, the Court has achieved this unanimity by deciding cases along narrow lines.

Reducing the First Amendment to a “trope” (a term Tushnet uses three times on page 231 alone) is a recipe for repression and demonstrates the American Left’s lamentable retreat from the libertarian position advocated by Justices Hugo Black and William O. Douglas. Having said that, one must acknowledge that Tushnet’s discussion of the *Citizens United* decision is remarkably evenhanded.

One would conclude from reading his account of the exclusionary rule that it dates from the Warren Court. In fact, the doctrine has ancient roots in common law (see, for example, *Jordan v. State*, 32 Miss. 382, 386–387 [1856]).

Tushnet asserts the difficulty of predicting the development of constitutional issues. He proves this by stating that the issues of presidential power and terrorism have “generally disappeared” (67). This seems less than prescient, given the recent decisions reining in Obama’s expansive notions of presidential power—particularly the unanimous decision rejecting the president’s claim that he, rather than the Senate, could determine when the Senate was in session for the purpose of making recess appointments.

Readers of this book will inevitably find some interesting insights; the author is always smart, but this book is not Tushnet at his best.

*University of Montana*  
Michael S. Mayer


The US Supreme Court regularly reviews cases dealing with sexual liberty, privacy, and freedom of speech. Where our understanding of sexuality and sexual privacy as a civil liberty originated and how it evolved is the subject of Leigh Ann Wheeler’s new work. In order to understand this evolutionary process, Wheeler examines the role of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the language of “sexual rights” and “sexual citizenship” as constitutionally protected speech. Within this context, she examines the “elasticity of civil liberties concepts,” questioning their inevitability and their progressive nature (5).
Instead of being inevitable, Wheeler argues that sexual civil liberties represent a transformation of sexual freedom and free speech, clashing over the ACLU’s desire to protect both sexual content and privacy.

In the first chapters, Wheeler takes readers back to the Greenwich Village of 1910, where sexual liberals and free thinkers thrived. She introduces the personalities—Roger Baldwin, Margaret Sanger, Emma Goldman, and Crystal Eastman—who, in the heyday of Progressive reform, began to address the need for birth control but also protect conscientious objectors and defend free speech. Although the organization did not initially take on issues of sexual liberty, Wheeler argues that the male founders and the liberal roots of the ACLU set it on a course to eventually address issues of sexual politics.

Moving beyond its Village roots, Wheeler argues that debates about sexual liberty shaped the ACLU, primarily the right to privacy and access to sexually explicit cultural content. Wheeler points out that although the ACLU initially rejected dealing with sexual activity, content, and harassment—identifying as an organization solely focused on freedom of speech—by the mid-century privacy rights were being used for both commercial protection and sexual conduct. This tension could no longer be ignored. US Supreme Court cases, the cultural successes of Playboy magazine, and Alfred Kinsey’s research into human sexuality all opened new ways for Americans to access and understand sexually explicit materials. Other new voices, such as Harriet Pilpel and Susan Brownmiller, worked to see the ACLU expand its efforts to include sexual privacy. The 1970s and 1980s saw the launch of the Women’s Rights and the Lesbian and Gay Rights Projects that expanded the ACLU’s agenda to include issues of reproductive freedom, sex discrimination, harassment, and rape. But though these changes appear progressive, Wheeler argues that they often came slowly and in conflict with a desire to protect speech.

Wheeler moves between analysis of ACLU work and biographical sketches of its founders and most vocal participants for a fully engaging and enlightening work on sexual liberty and the ACLU. While exploring the growing pains and conflict of the organization, Wheeler suggests that Americans have become more comfortable with an expanded definition of civil liberties and that the ACLU that brought these issues, sometimes in conflict, to the center of the argument about American constitutionalism.

Wichita State University
Robin C. Henry

Several historians have explored Abraham Lincoln’s relationship with his presidential secretaries, John Hay and John Nicolay, but the author of this book offers a fresh perspective on Lincoln’s “boys” by exploring “their life’s work after the Civil War” to “create a definitive and enduring historical image of the slain leader” (4). The Lincoln that most Americans know today, Joshua Zeitz argues, was the direct result of his secretaries’ ten-volume authorized biography of the president.

The first three parts of *Lincoln’s Boys* examine Hay and Nicolay’s journey from the bottomlands of the Mississippi River to the halls of the White House. Zeitz maintains that their close attachment to Lincoln, their association with several Republican politicians after the Civil War, and their success as diplomats and writers provided them with a unique opportunity to relate Lincoln’s life to the public.

The author devotes the remainder of the book to evaluating Hay and Nicolay’s efforts in crafting Lincoln’s legacy in *Abraham Lincoln: A History* [1890]. Using their own collected materials and having been granted access to the president’s papers by Robert Todd Lincoln, they sought to counter the unflattering stories about Lincoln promulgated by his former Springfield, Illinois, law partner William Herndon as well as the salacious, ghostwritten biography of Lincoln written by his friend Ward Hill Lamon. First partially serialized and later published by *The Century*, Hay and Nicolay’s biography provided an opportunity to revise history and secure “Lincoln’s legacy” by identifying slavery as the true cause of the war, venerating the Gettysburg Address, and entrenching it as one of America’s quintessential documents in order to “diminish the reputation of George McClellan” and recast Lincoln’s political rival, Treasury Secretary Salmon P. Chase, as an inept politician (296). But as Zeitz persuasively demonstrates, *Abraham Lincoln* also allowed them to counter the Southern interpretation of the war that began to dominate historical memory in the 1880s. In this way, the biography ultimately became the “unofficial Northern, Republican Party interpretation of the Civil War” (264). Hay and Nicolay followed their first act with the publication of Lincoln’s complete works in 1894, allowing, as Zeitz correctly argues, their interpretation of the war and that of Lincoln to dominate the scholarly literature until Lincoln’s papers were opened to the public in 1947 at the Library of Congress. The lasting power of *Abraham Lincoln* was also felt in other ways, Zeitz claims. Although Americans collected
personal objects related to the president immediately after his death, Zeitz maintains that their study of the sixteenth president inspired the rise of Lincolniana and America’s fascination with Lincoln.

If any criticism can be lodged, it is that Nicolay’s voice is noticeably silent throughout the book. Undoubtedly, this is related to the simple fact that Hay occupied a more prominent role in literary and public circles after the Civil War and subsequently created a voluminous written record. Still, it is refreshing to see Zeitz tackle Nicolay’s oft-neglected postwar career. There is much to admire about Lincoln’s Boys—it is grounded in superb research, it is a highly entertaining narrative, and the lack of academic jargon will attract the historical enthusiast and scholar alike, yet again making Lincoln’s life accessible to the American public.

Institute for Political History

Matthew C. Sherman

Asia and the Pacific


Empress Dowager Cixi has both intrigued and perplexed the imaginations of scholars searching for emerging modernity in China. Who was Cixi? As one of the few women rulers in Chinese history, several waves of scholarship have placed Cixi within rather different frames, emphasizing various images of her complex life, from femme fatale to powerful woman and reformer. In Jung Chang’s book, Cixi becomes the superhero who, as her book title states, “launched modern China.”

This study is a provocative attempt to rewrite the Chinese history of Cixi’s time. In the author’s treatment of late Qing history, the standard masculine narrative of male figures making modern China is replaced by a Cixi-centered history of China’s modernization and interaction with the external world. Chang’s book seeks to provide an alternative interpretation regarding almost all the major historical events and figures of the time. One example is China’s relationship with the West. According to Chang, once Cixi accomplished the coup and became the “real ruler of China” after her husband’s death, she quickly switched China’s international relations from Emperor Xianfeng’s “all-consuming hatred” toward the West and the “closed-door policy of 100 years” to a new course of “opening it up to the outside world” (50, 55). And thus, “under Cixi, China entered a long period of peace with the West” and maintained an open-door policy even when Cixi faced a strong xenophobic faction
within China (57). This open-door policy provided Cixi with the economic benefit of income from customs revenues and an open mindset to assume her role as China’s modernizer and reformer during her reign. Cixi, in Chang’s book, is credited with China’s post-Taiping developments of reconstruction, the Self-Strengthening Movement, the Reforms of 1898, and the late Qing reforms. Even when faced with an attempted assassination by her enemies, Cixi still “wished the Reforms to continue” and placed the interest of the country before her personal safety. In contrast, male figures, such as Kang Youwei and the Guanxu Emperor, were the narrow-minded people who cared more about their personal power and gains (245).

Chang presents a radically different interpretation of Cixi and her time, suggesting that she was an intentional and conscious modernizer and reformer as well as a virtuous and likeable woman. As a popular text on Cixi, Chang’s book is intriguing and well written. As a serious historical account, this reader hoped the author would provide more concrete and convincing evidence to support her claims in various places. For example, much more evidence is needed to back up the author’s claim that the Reforms of 1898 “had been launched and spearheaded by Cixi” and the alleged assassination of the Dowager (245). Nevertheless, Chang’s popular book on Cixi will undoubtedly draw more scholarly attention to her subject and force scholars to rethink and reevaluate alternative ways of understanding the Chinese history of Cixi’s time.

Fairfield University

Danke Li

Civil Examinations and Meritocracy in Late Imperial China. By Benjamin A. Elman. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. 389. $45.00.)

One of the key elements buttressing the sustainability of the Chinese empire from the fifteenth century to its end in 1905 was the civil service examination institution, which was finalized in its perfect form in the late imperial dynasties of Ming and Qing. The author of this book discusses all the facets in this newly accomplished study, which is very much based on his previous solid research. It is a good book for anyone who is interested in understanding the nature of late imperial China.

Benjamin Elman draws from impressive sources such as original documents from as far back as the sixteenth century and famous Chinese books such as the memoir by Shang Yanliu, one of the 1904 licentiates that has rarely been used by English writers. All these strongly support his findings. Elman believes that the Cheng-Zhu persuasion was well established by the early Ming rulers as
the orthodox ideology. The usurper, Emperor Yongle [r. 1402–1424], was especially critical in this Neo-Confucian Way learning movement, by which he was legitimized as an ideal sage-king. Together with lower Yangzi literati, the court created a new ruling class through the civil service examinations based on this ideology.

The civil service was not a truly open system. Classical literacy with the Way learning, the Eight-Legged Essay, and basic language skills hindered plebeians from joining the ruling circle. Elman does not agree with Ho Ping-ti’s observation that the civil examinations played the central role in social mobility. He believes, rather, that the meritocracy was limited.

Manchu’s Qing dynasty easily carried through the system to rule China skillfully. As population multiplied and competition became cutthroat, cheating was rife and corruption rampant. The meritocracy was profoundly undermined. Elman interestingly coins the term “cultural prisons” to refer to the system and needless to say the examination halls, which were intimidating and horrible, wounded candidates who failed. Many fell into bizarre abjectness, and the furious among them launched uprisings. This collective anxiety is beautifully addressed in chapters 5 and 6, occupying almost one-third of the book, and these essays will definitely help future scholars deepen their understanding of this anxiety.

The Manchu court was, nevertheless, far more reform minded. Elman posits that since the mid-eighteenth century, the court retooled the system by absorbing the “evidential studies” of Han Learning and reviving a poetry-writing tradition into the content of the examinations. Despite the fact that the Bible was once included in the examinations during the Taiping uprising, the Qing reforms remained intact up to 1905.

Elman correctly points out that the examinations critically connected the court and society. He successfully describes the detailed origins and development of the examination from Ming to the High Qing dynasties. However, the concluding chapter on post-Taiping China is too hasty and murky to reveal the changing nature of the coming modernity. One of the finest products of the examinations, Li Hongzhang, the leader of the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, keenly sensed the changing era as the dawning of the new age, which was “unprecedented in the last three thousand years.” That is why the imperial civil examinations were abandoned by the ancient regime. However, the institutions remain there to revamp the meritocracy, and the pains of the anxiety still affect China as well as the rest of East Asia.

*University of Minnesota at Morris*  
Hsiang-Wang Liu

The question “does Japan matter?” is a tired cliché but one that has persisted over the two and a half decades since Japan’s postwar economic bubble burst, taking with it the belief that Japan’s already apparent systemic problems of monoculturalism and demographics (to take just two examples) could be overcome by a new model of national economic power. Editors Christopher Gerteis and Timothy George combat this persistent strand of Japan-questioning in popular new discourse by bringing together fourteen leading and emerging scholars. Although most contributors are historians, the collection also includes historically minded contributions from sociologists, anthropologists, and legal scholars in a reflection of what the editors describe as the complex “intellectual boundaries where history leaves off and other disciplines begin” (4).

The book’s interdisciplinary focus complicates in constructive ways the now-familiar historical trajectory of Japan as moving from the first non-Western modernizing power in the late nineteenth century, through empire and military defeat, into midcentury economic prosperity, and on to arguably one of the world’s first postindustrial societies. The book’s focus on the post-1945 period is a welcome update to the now-landmark 1993 collection Postwar Japan as History, which set the parameters of postwar Japanese historiography over the subsequent two decades. This volume may provide a similar function, engaging as it does with history’s influence on and by other disciplinary approaches in recent decades, notably in the fields of transnational history and memory and heritage studies.

日本 Since 1945 is divided into four sections, which deal with “civic life, the legacies of war and military occupation, the emergence of a postindustrial economy, and the interaction of public memory with…social, political and economic trajectories” (4). The uniformly excellent contributions largely take the form of case studies with broader historiographical implications. Particular highlights for this reader included the expected high quality contributions from leading scholars Laura Hein (on Japan’s first modern art museum, which sought to decenter nationalism through the valorization of bourgeois art cultures), Christine Yano (on the possibilities provided by Japan’s “jet-age nationhood”), and Timothy George (on reinvention strategies for declining rural locales). Two articles contribute to the growing scholarship on Japanese historical memory beyond the war—in Christopher Gerteis’s case, through a
study of corporate historical initiatives as public relations exercises and in Hiraku Shimoda’s examination of an “ode to twentieth century industrial manufacturing” broadcast on the national NHK network (256). Other highlights include Martin Dusinberre’s eloquent argument for the necessity of “excavating” stories of the local to rescue “history from the overarching historiographical frame of the nation” and Sally Hastings’s exposure of the “historiography of invisibility” of career nurses, who, through their training and work patterns, undercut dominant narratives of gendered work and life in postwar Japan.

The collection is by no means exhaustive, but in the breadth of contributions it offers a glimpse of the richness and diversity of contemporary scholarship on postwar Japan.

University of Sheffield

Mark Pendleton


Writing the contemporary history of South Asia is a daunting task, to say the least. The author of this book does it with skill and authority. In addition to India and Pakistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, the Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Afghanistan are considered part of South Asia. The author focuses on Partition, which created India and Pakistan. He laments that, “given cooler heads and a bit more time, Partition might well have been avoided altogether” (xxxiv). The demand for the Partition of India was set forth by the All-India Muslim League on grounds that the Muslims were not simply a minority but a separate nation, while the Indian National Congress, claiming to represent all Indians irrespective of their caste, creed, or color, wanted to keep India united. The British tried unsuccessfully to find a formula that could keep India united but as a loose federation with maximum powers residing in the provinces. The last viceroy, Lord Louis Mountbatten, announced the Partition Plan on 3 June 1947. Pakistan was to constitute two separate wings where Muslims were in a majority and the rest of British India was to become India. Partition was implemented in great haste amid escalating violence and the rapidly diminishing authority of the colonial state. Ultimately, some fifteen million Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs crossed the international border between the two states, and at least one million were killed.

A sordid legacy of disputes over the division of colonial assets and territory, most notably the princely state of Jammu and Kashmir, devolved upon India
and Pakistan. Consequently, constant tension and confrontation, three wars, and two mini-wars between them have resulted in huge spending on defense, including nuclear weapons. The main casualty has been human development.

Within India and Pakistan, cultural heterogeneity has posed serious problems for national consolidation. Indian democracy has managed in most cases to accommodate such tensions through the creation of new states (provinces), but in its northeastern states in which non-Hindus are the majority, Punjab—with a slight Sikh majority—and Muslim Kashmir, separatist movements have raged for years; some have been pacified but not all. Besides Pakistan, India has had troubled relations with some other neighbors, such as Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka. On the other hand, Pakistan, where the military has been in power for long periods of time, had a civil war in East Pakistan, in which India intervened militarily, resulting in that wing of the country breaking away to become Bangladesh in December 1971. However, India has successfully liberalized its economy and has done very well. The author observes, “both despite Partition and because of it—South Asia remains as distinct and crisis prone a political entity as the Middle East…. With a population greater than China’s, it is already the world’s largest market, and it may well host the world’s next superpower” (352). Not surprisingly, the United States and China have been seeking greater roles in South Asia.

Ishtiaq Ahmed
Stockholm University Emeritus


This is the first serious study of the secret agent system of the early years of the People’s Republic of China. Many in China are familiar with the heroic deeds of underground Communist agents who worked against the Nationalists, the Japanese, and other enemies before 1949, but few are aware that there were underground agents living and working among the people after 1949. Obviously, the agents in post-1949 China faced less danger and were less mysterious and legendary than those of the pre-1949 period. Another difference between the two groups is that most of the pre-1949 agents were “good guys”—Communists or Communist sympathizers—while many of the post-1949 agents were former “bad guys” who were forced to work for the new state.

Michael Schoenhals’s portrayal of the secret agent system is informative and comprehensive. The book starts with a general description of the public security system, and the subsequent chapters deal with the categories and the
recruitment base of the agents as well as the operational profiling, enlisting, training, and management of the agents. This very detailed account is based mainly on a study of official documents and archives produced during that period. The book is well organized, clearly written, and very easy and interesting to read.

Though some readers might expect to read about how these secret agents helped suppress the people and turn China into a demonic, Communist police state, the collective image of the secret agents as presented in this book is neutral, even benign, but not evil. There was corruption in the system, and there were also charges made by both officials and citizens that some agents had done harmful things toward the masses; but overall the agents were not enemies of “the people.” The secret agents were deployed to deal with real or imagined enemies of the new state or to protect crucial state assets, and they served to crash antigovernment and antisociety attempts to thwart the government. Communist leaders did not perceive ordinary people as real or potential enemies, and therefore they planted no secret agents in the vast countryside. It was their belief that relying on the masses alone would not guarantee the elimination of all enemies that caused the creation of the secret agent system. It was their realization that some secret agents had turned against the people and that mobilizing the masses would be a sufficient means of defeating the enemies that prompted them to end that system. The author basically presents the sources as they are and makes no attempt at overinterpreting them.

Since a few of those agents may still be alive, it would have been helpful if the author had conducted oral interviews with some of them. He makes frequent references to the KGB but does not provide a clear and systematic analysis of the differences and similarities between the Chinese secret agent system and other state security institutions such as the KGB and the FBI.

Lingnan University, Hong Kong

Xiaorong Han


The book under review offers a rich, comprehensive analysis of how the evolution of Pakistan’s military and its continuing control over the body politic makes it impossible for the country to emerge as a proper democracy. It unravels new material by locating some of the Pakistani military writings and interviews with generals and offering a lens on their worldviews. In nine chapters,
Aqil Shah narrates the story of how the Pakistani army became the most important societal actor in the country and the reasons for this continued dominance, which is in contrast with neighboring India or the large number of erstwhile military-ruled states that have become proper democracies in the past three decades. A detailed analysis on pivotal moments when the military strengthened its position is provided.

Though the reviewer sees much merit in the book, a few drawbacks need to be addressed. The book is more in the category of a rich narrative tradition than a theoretical explanation for why Pakistan is the way it is. It does not offer a compelling causal mechanism other than repeatedly describing the Indian threat. The author needs to explain how accurate the perception of this threat has been rather than accepting on face value the almost paranoid assessments that Pakistani military men make of the Indian threat (which he quotes frequently). From the discussion, it appears that the threat is an excuse for some larger reason for a military to behave this way, as many countries facing existential threats have become developmental states and proper democracies after periods of military rule: Korea, Taiwan, and Indonesia are good examples of this.

Missing also is a discussion of the strategic and civilizational parity that the military elite have been seeking with India, a neighbor some seven or eight times larger in most parameters of material power. If the threat perception is largely based on India’s size, then India’s disintegration or complete weakening would be the only condition that would make Pakistan secure. All the other things the military talks about—India fomenting internal conflict in Pakistan, supporting Afghanistan’s development, and so on—are exaggerated arguments often mirroring what Pakistan does toward India. All major wars—except, to some extent, the 1971 case—and a majority of the crises in this dyad have been initiated by Pakistan, and this itself shows who the revisionist party is in this instance. India’s strategy (arguably even with the “Cold Start” doctrine of a faster, more concentrated mobilization in the event of a major terrorist attack by Pakistan-supported Islamist groups) is reactive and defensive, as the onus of first strike often rests with Pakistan.

A second problem is the dismissal of class structure as an explanation. It seems to the reviewer that Pakistan’s main problem is the absence of a powerful middle or labor class willing to defend democracy and push for change. The collaboration between the landed aristocracy and the military has created a cocktail for the worst form of governance and economic organization for a country anywhere in the modern world. Without land reforms, the country is
unlikely to generate a viable middle class. The military keeps playing double
games to extract as much money from the great powers and friendly states as
possible, and depending on these resources for its own corporatist interests has
generated a geostrategic curse on Pakistan.

Despite these weaknesses, this book adds to our understanding of a highly
complex country and is a welcome addition to the growing literature on
Pakistan’s multifaceted challenges.

McGill University

T. V. Paul

Europe

Why Can the Dead Do Such Great Things?: Saints and Worshippers from the Mar-

The author of this study has produced what is to this reviewer’s knowledge the first
textbook on the premodern cult of the saints and at—I cannot resist the tempta-
tion—a miraculously low price. Luckily, Robert Bartlett is more than equal to the
task. This book should be useful both to readers who want an introduction to the
early cult and to experts in the field who want to avail themselves of a senior schol-
ar’s extensive index card collection/database of cases in point.

The first part of the book is a narrative consisting of four chapters dealing with
developments from AD 100 through the year 1588, or from the earliest evidence
for the cult of the martyrs through the results of the Reformation. Bartlett consid-
ered the development of the cult alongside the development of Christianity, an intel-
ligent decision both because the former reflected the latter and because the primary
audience for this book frequently has little detailed understanding of either topic.
The second part is thematic with an interest in identifying categories of phenomena
and their scope. The chapter titles and subheadings provided in the table of con-
tents are a good guide to what one can expect to find in this part.

Bartlett’s writing is measured and deft, as one would expect from a scholar
of his caliber. Researchers in the field might wonder why he would include a
comparative treatment of Christian saints and “pagan” gods, a topic that is by
now historiographically passé, but anyone who has taught the subject probably
knows that nonexperts routinely ask whether the saints were merely Roman or
Irish gods sheathed in a Christian veneer. The author also displays great skill in
finding fitting examples, using cases that both illustrate the point and pique
interest.
Two critiques may be offered. First, although the logic of *De Imitatio Christi* undergirds most of the book, this reviewer could not find any explicit discussion of the theology of sanctity. Readers discover what traits Christians believed were holy but not why. This omission is problematic because, if the three institutions where this reviewer has taught are at all representative, it lends itself to the implicit anti-Catholic prejudices entertained by many American students (the reviewer was once blithely informed that Catholics are, of course, not Christians). They might interpret too cynically Bartlett’s explanation that the saints were primarily intercessors, though they were also to be imitated and admired. Second, the author might have sacrificed some illustrative detail for more historiography. Despite relatively frequent general references to the scholarship and an excellent bibliography, the book treats the cult of the saints as an almost positivistic object rather than something we know because we have asked specific questions about it. Teachers will have to earn their pay preparing students to delve into more specialized publications. However, this textbook is of such high quality that this reviewer suspects it will not find a competitor for quite some time.

*Kansas State University*

David Defries


The nature of Norman power in the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been debated among historians for some decades, and those discussions have clustered around the extent to which there were institutional links and connections between the territories subject to Norman rule and how far a Norman identity enabled domination. Author David Bates has already made important contributions to these debates in previous publications. In this book, he carefully reviews the historiography and then offers an alternative view of elements of Norman history, together with a suggestion for possibilities in future research.

The main thrust of the book is that structural and ideological readings of Norman history are overly schematic and do not convey the lived experience of participation in, or even engagement with, Norman power. The author takes it as axiomatic that identities and alliances are provisional and can be made and remade as circumstances dictate; he labels his approach situational-constructionist. Thus, an idea that the author comes to again and again is “life stories,” which he opposes to the more static prosopography and defines to
mean how individuals might have thought of themselves in changing patterns over time as circumstances changed around them. He discusses a number of such life stories and suggests that the compilation of such narratives might form a useful focus for future research.

After introducing his overall approach, Bates puts William the Conqueror himself at the center of the discussion. He argues that the Norman dukes had a unique capacity for protagonism in the middle of the eleventh century and that this allowed them to initiate the expansion of their power; thereafter, the extended range of their influence meant that others had to engage with them in order to do what they wanted. Dukes of Normandy became central to networks including Normandy and England but extending out into other parts of France, Wales, and Scotland. This need to engage with the Norman duke-kings is what Bates defines as the basis for Norman hegemony.

Overall, the book presents an interesting thesis, which has real explanatory value in some circumstances. The idea of a loose Norman hegemony in Bates’s terms works rather well for Wales and Scotland, for example, and aids understanding of aspects of elite politics. It does have some shortcomings as an overall view of Norman rule, though. It is almost entirely concerned with the elites of the territories covered and tends to turn Norman rule into little more than a matter of elite networking. It is hard to see how the rest of the population might have fitted into this framework even though their experiences of Norman rule were very different and equally valid. The book is more a subtle and learned study of elite identities and personal politics than a totalizing thesis on the Norman empire as a whole. Perhaps a less grandiose title would have suited the book better.

University of Southampton

Nicholas Karn


In constructing their invaluable online searchable databases (www.medievalsoldier.org) between 2006 and 2009, the authors of this study collected some 250,000 service records from the numerous English muster rolls for the period 1369–1453 and supplemented them with other documentary evidence. This book is the result of a rigorous prosopographical analysis of that data. Unlike earlier, more narrowly focused studies, this comprehensive methodology has allowed for firmer conclusions concerning those who comprised English armies
in these years. Particularly valuable is the greater understanding it provides of patterns of service and careers over the long term. This rich study of the various social and functional groups that rendered military service has produced, among myriad enlightening details, strong evidence of the emergence of a definite military professionalization in later medieval England.

The authors organize the military community of the time into groups of descending social status, from peers to knights and other men-at-arms, down to archers and other miscellaneous types of soldiers, all of whom are represented on the muster rolls. For each of these, the authors provide evidence of the length, scope, and frequency of their military activities, thus determining to what degree they can be regarded as professionals. As one would expect given their military education and chivalric ethos, the peers and knights served in a variety of roles and theaters of war, some choosing to spend long careers in arms. These the authors refer to as “socio-professionals,” men who were expected due to their class to possess the skills, resources, and willingness to go to war. In many ways, though, growing military professionalization as we understand it—positioning oneself for financial and social advancement through a sustained pattern of paid military service—is more evident in the subknightly men-at-arms and archers, both of which formed much larger (and growing) proportions of the armies of the day. Encompassing those of gentle birth as well as men who rose from the ranks of archers through their military abilities, the nongentle men-at-arms were willing to commit to long periods of service in France, making them increasingly vital to the war effort, especially in the years of occupation after 1420. Professionalization is also characteristic of the archers. Even among these lesser men, probably recruited primarily from the relatively prosperous yeoman class, there are examples of lengthy careers in arms, advancement in rank, and increased wealth from service.

*The Soldier in Later Medieval England* is a work of profound significance to English military and social history. What sets it apart from earlier studies of medieval soldiers is the sheer mass of data upon which it is founded. Although the result is strongly numerical, clear tables throughout assist the reader in making sense of the numbers, and many fascinating case studies help bring them to life. Although most useful to professionals, graduate students, and advanced undergraduates, it is a very readable work for the educated layman as well. This important book will be the new foundation for all future studies of late medieval military service.

*Saint Vincent College*  
Gilbert Bogner

This book is an account of German crimes in the East. More precisely, it is a history of the crimes committed against Jews by certain units of the German Wehrmacht behind the front lines in occupied Belarus in 1941. The author focuses on the motivations of the German soldiers and the mechanisms that made them and their units accessories to the Nazi policy of “Final Solution.”

From the early stages of war against the Soviet Union, argues Waitman Wade Beorn, the Wehrmacht became involved in the terrorizing and murdering of Jews. The orders came from the very top—from Marshal Wilhelm Keitel himself—but lower officers acted on their own as well. In July 1941, German commanders were already selecting Jews to perform forced and often humiliating labor, introducing curfews for the “non-Aryan population,” and ordering Jews to wear yellow patches with the Star of David. Some of them even spearheaded the concentration of the Jews in improvised local ghettos. The author is, however, less interested in general trends and central decisions; his goal is rather to track, document, and explain their practical consequences behind the front lines.

The first discussed case of the Wehrmacht’s role in the Holocaust involves two companies of the 3rd Battalion of the 354th Infantry Regiment that took part in mass murder at Krynki, a small town some seventy miles northeast of Minsk. The soldiers, having previously spent some time guarding a camp for Soviet POWs, were already used to the sight of executions, selections, and starvation, and they had a good firsthand knowledge of the atrocities of war in the East. The next step—taking part in murdering Jewish civilians—proved to be a relatively minor one. In early September, two companies were ordered by their commander to help the notorious Einsatzkommando 8 in its task. The task at hand consisted of murdering all the Jews of Krynki—men, women, and children. The soldiers, who in principle were only required to provide logistical help to guard and escort the Jews to the execution site, went beyond and above their duties. According to the testimonies filed in German court some twenty years later, some of them took part in the shooting, some shot the Jews who tried to flee the execution ditches, some guarded access roads to keep away the curious locals, while still others took pictures of the unfolding horror.

Interestingly, as in so many other known cases, the soldiers could simply refuse to take part in this mission, but there were more than enough volunteers
eager to take their place. In fact, out of the 130 soldiers deployed, only one (!) decided to refuse to participate: Martin S. What a pity that the bizarre German archival rules prevent the author from giving his full name. Martin S. informed his commanding officer that he had four kids back home and that he was unable and unwilling to watch the execution of Jews. Lieutenant M. showed his understanding and assigned Martin S. guard duties in the barracks, and that was it. Others, in the meantime, remained loyal to “team spirit” and joined the Einsatzkommando 8 in the killings; some were swept away by the “current of unfolding events,” while still others became demoralized by the example given by several officers and NCOs who acted with particular barbarism.

Looking for answers, the author argues that the internal dynamics among the members of the units (the so-called “unit culture”), as well as the character of the officers involved, in large part shaped the subsequent actions of the German soldiers. The soldiers were also subject to (and receptive of) the Nazi propaganda, which equated Jews with Bolsheviks and pro-Soviet partisans. Another important observation deals with the phenomenon of the length of exposure of soldiers to the brutalities of war “in the East”: The longer they remained in touch with the realities of the horrors of war, the more likely they were to become willing participants in the mass murder of Jews. Beorn’s conclusions are generally in line with the earlier findings of Christopher Browning, Stefan Klemp, Yehoshua Büchler, and Dieter Pohl, to name but a few of the many who studied the actions of the perpetrators. Some of them wrote about the Reserve Police battalions, some about the rear technical units of the Waffen-SS, and others studied the Wehrmacht.

The book’s historical value is linked—to a major extent—to some four hundred testimonies filed in German courts by German soldiers in the 1960s. The author is aware of the methodological problems pertaining to this particular source: The testimonies were filed during criminal proceedings against the members of Wehrmacht units under investigation, witnesses tried to shift the blame away from themselves and their comrades, and prosecutors’ interests were very different from the interests of historians studying the Holocaust half a century later. Beorn tries to seek some balance, adding to the mix a number of Jewish testimonies. Some of them come from the German trials and some from the Visual History Archive (the so-called Spielberg collection) of fifty thousand interviews with the survivors of the Holocaust collected after 1995.

In this context, it is unfortunate that the book ignores the postwar Soviet investigations against the German perpetrators and their local facilitators. These documents (of fundamental value to the discussed topic) have recently
entered the academic domain and have been successfully used by Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian historians. Incidentally, the nearly total exclusion of east European historical writing from Beorn’s bibliography underlines the relative insularity of his research. Historians interested in the study of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe have an obligation to look at linguistically diverse evidence that reflects the backgrounds of the victims, perpetrators, and bystanders. Unfortunately, the documents and studies written in Yiddish, Polish, Russian, or Ukrainian present challenges that the author is unable to face. Some of these sources—contemporaneous to the described events—are of particular value to historians. For instance, Jewish testimonies from collections 301 and 302 of the Jewish Historical Institute (ZIH) in Warsaw would have been of enormous help to the author. And there are dozens of pertinent testimonies from Slonim, Lida, Nowogródek, and the surrounding areas, held at the ZIH. Even more striking is the absence of historical evidence from Emanuel Ringelblum’s Oneg Shabbat archive—contemporary to the described events and dealing with the Holocaust in locations discussed in the book.

“Ultimately,” writes the author, “we must never forget that the story we are telling is the story of the Jewish victims, these millions of individuals who died, suffered, or, against all odds, survived the Nazi attempt to exterminate them.” As far as this premise is concerned, the book, unfortunately, is a disappointment. Instead, *Marching into Darkness* is a good example of the Täterforschung (study of perpetrators); it is a very interesting, often moving, and well-written but somewhat incomplete record of the described events.

*University of Ottawa*

Jan Grabowski


Much of Europe after the Great War abandoned the steps towards democracy taken during the nineteenth century. The majority of states, as they coped with the massive problems that the Great War had caused, turned in the 1920s and 1930s to some sort of fascist or socialist dictatorship. Hitler’s war in 1939 discredited the fascist regimes, and Stalin planted Marxist regimes in many of the former fascist states. For forty years after the Second World War, east-central Europe suffered under leftist dictatorships, which only collapsed with the end of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s. Since then, there has been a resurgence
of democracy in the former authoritarian states, but the progress has been uneven, and there have been setbacks, such as Putin’s Russia.

Writing a comparative history of twentieth-century European dictatorships is an ambitious undertaking, but it is one that Gerhard Besier and Katarzyna Stoklosa have completed with success. They ask how could it happen that continental Europe in the twentieth century became a “Europe of the Dictatorships” (1). Their answer is multifaceted. Though they say that Europe began the new century after the Great War in 1919, they point out that the “constitutional-democratic” progress of the century before then “did not seem to fit the political traditions and mentalities of most European peoples” (1). This, coupled with the dehumanizing colonial experience of the nineteenth century and the destruction of the Great War, “destabilized and discredited” the cultural liberalism that had only recently seen success and strengthened the authoritarian national influence (8). The result, detailed in section 1 of the book, was a transition to fascist dictatorships in the 1920s that was paralleled in some ways by the developments in Stalin’s Russia. Section 2 describes how this period was followed by the collapse of most fascist states during the Second World War, the “forced export of socialism to Central Eastern and South Eastern Europe,” and the breakdown of that postwar system (264). Each section of the book has an introduction followed by a look at individual states and what was unique to them as well as what fit the general pattern of drift towards dictatorship. The authors look closely at the development of the Soviet Union, fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany, but they also give attention to the less obvious, such as fascist Spain and Portugal, Vichy France, Norway’s Quisling, and the Baltic States.

Besier is Director of the Sigmund Neumann Institute for the Research on Freedom, Liberty, and Democracy in Dresden, and Stoklosa is an associate professor in the Department of Border Region Studies at the University of Southern Denmark in Sonderborg. Their book is not light reading, as the targeted audience is scholars in the field. There are extensive notes, a few charts, and one map, but no bibliography. The meat in the 612 pages of text is very rewarding. One will find within it a greater understanding of the historical processes that led to the fascist and socialist dictatorships that dominated much of Europe’s twentieth century and how they contributed to some of the difficulties today.

University of Mary Washington  Porter R. Blakemore

One of the many publications resulting from the five-hundredth anniversary of the accession of perhaps England’s most famous king, this collection of seventeen essays has its origins in a conference held at Hampton Court Palace in 2009. It is distinguished less by its overall coherence than by the invariably high quality and originality of the contributions, which are divided into seven parts: “Writing about Henry VIII,” “Material Culture,” “Images,” “Court Culture,” “Reactions,” “Performance,” and “Afterword.” All of these essays have interesting things to tell readers, and a few are brilliantly insightful. Twenty-one color images enhance the usefulness of the volume.

The book is indicative of trends in recent research and debate in its neglect of political institutions and popular religion in the age of Reformation. Rather, the emphasis is on cultural history of various kinds and the links between culture and power. Particularly satisfying in this regard are the three art historical essays by Kent Rawlinson (on architectural representations in pictures of the king), Brett Dolman (who, frustratingly, does not want us to make psychological judgments of Henry’s queens from their portraits), and Tatiana C. String (on the real significance of Karel van Mander’s comments on Holbein’s Whitehall Mural). Mention should also be made of Ruth Ahnert’s study of Thomas Wyatt’s prison poems and Elizabeth T. Hurren’s exploration of medical culture, which is as intriguing as it is enigmatic.

Another noteworthy threesome are the essays by Eamon Duffy, Susan Brigden, and Thomas S. Freeman on, respectively, Reginald Pole, the threat of an invasion of England in 1539, and Katharine Parr. (It is unclear why Duffy’s essay has Hampton Court in its title.) These more political studies are preceded by the first chapter in the collection, which is a reflection by George Bernard on his own journey in Henrician historiography, from the old view that Henry was the plaything of political and religious factions at court to that of his major work, The King’s Reformation, published in 2005, in which Henry is very much in control of events. Although Bernard claims to be fed up with being called “contentious,” the fact that this chapter occupies pride of place in this collection, and that some of the other essays tend to accord with his conclusions, suggests that his “unconventional propositions” are beginning to take hold (16, 20). At least many historians will surely now agree with Bernard that Henry was shrewd, ruthless, cynical, and cruel, even if they remain more
hesitant about Bernard’s explanation, for example, for the deaths of Thomas Cromwell or (as Suzannah Lipscomb testifies in her fascinating chapter in this volume) Anne Boleyn. The studies by Duffy and Freeman, as well as the account by Maria Hayward of the extent to which Henry used confiscations to enhance his wealth, lend credence in different ways to Bernard’s thesis. There is an irony in celebrating the anniversary of this monarch when scholarly opinion seems to be moving towards the view that he really was the “worst man in the world” (233).


The author of this book has returned again to the history of the early Christian church in the West. Histories of the early Christian church are nothing new, but in this work the author tackles the topic in a way that illuminates an important and underappreciated aspect of the early church: wealth. Given the temporal limits of his examination, two centuries between Constantine I and Pope Gregory I, it is an extremely lengthy study. Those readers interested in the evolution of the Western church or in a good social approach or both will find this book a splendid treatment.

Peter Brown’s work is the result of a long, detailed study of the relationship between wealth and the early church with the goal of understanding the role of wealth as Christianity went from being an accepted religion in the Roman world to being the dominant religion of medieval Europe after the fifth century. It is a study in which Brown observes that he has had to change his mind on some of his earlier convictions about the period (xxvii). For example, he concludes that it was not the conversion of Constantine in 312 but the entry of the wealthy into the church in the 370s that was the turning point in its success. Although one might expect a work focused on wealth to focus on elites, this is not the case; attitudes toward wealth in the church ran across society, and Brown keeps his focus on a social history approach. He capably mines his limited literary sources and effectively draws on material culture as well to provide a much more effective treatment. In the process of following wealth, the work provides a good discussion of society and social change over the course of a lengthy period. In addition to the church, it also provides a useful examination of the way in which the Roman Empire changed into medieval Europe.
The book is organized into parts and chapters, which are arranged regionally and chronologically. There are five chronologically based parts following the evolution of the church in the West: 312–370, 360–412, 410–530, 530–555, and the conclusions. The parts are not symmetrically organized by date or page count, thus avoiding a false impression of smooth, orderly change over time. Within each part, the chapters are organized regionally and often anchored by particular individual authors such as Paulinus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome. This arrangement gives Brown and his readers a set of individuals upon which to hang the analysis and narrative. It also contributes to the way Brown capitalizes on the available sources. By the time the reader arrives at the conclusion, the entire narrative has introduced key individuals, journeyed through the various geographical parts of the Western church, and brought together his various points and proven his thesis. This thorough work will become the standard go-to study of the early Christian church in the West.

*Western Illinois University*

Lee L. Brice


The centerpiece of this volume on early Soviet-Western relations is the author’s findings from the Foreign Policy Archives of the Russian Federation and the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History. Michael Carley complements these findings with current archival research by Russian scholars and with sources detailing the West’s earliest dealings with the Soviet Union. The result is the most comprehensive English-language account to date of the interactions between the People’s Commissariat for Foreign Affairs (NKID) and its counterparts in Germany, France, Britain, and the United States in the years from 1921 to 1930.

The author makes a compelling case for a revision of Western notions of early Soviet foreign policy—notions that, he argues, merely reflect Cold War discourses. Foreign policy based on communist ideology may have been the position of the Politburo and the Comintern in the 1920s, but in no way did this apply to the NKID, which made “calculations based on realpolitik, according to Machiavelli, not Marx” (309). Carley’s evidence shows that the commissar for foreign affairs and his deputy, Georgy Vasilyevich Chicherin and Maksim Maksimovich Litvinov, respectively, were above all pragmatic diplomats (whose pragmatism often put them at odds with the central government).
The main objectives of the NKID under Chicherin and Litvinov were to reestablish bilateral relations with the West, to resolve the question of debts incurred by the tsarist government, and to secure vital loans to rebuild industry and infrastructure in the USSR, not to spread the revolution across Europe.

The story Carley tells is at times frustrating to read, given the constant failure of the NKID and its Western counterparts to reach an equitable agreement. He offsets this feeling of inertia, however, with his fluid style and narrative talent, elegantly juxtaposing Soviet and Western internal communications at crucial junctions in European history. This succeeds particularly well in chapter 2, which culminates in the Genoa Conference and the signing of the Treaty of Rapallo; in chapter 6, which deals with the impact of Soviet involvement in China; and in chapter 11, which details the reopening of diplomatic relations between Britain and the USSR. Though this study as a whole will appeal to scholars with a special interest in diplomatic history, these sections are must-reads for anyone interested in early Soviet history.

Carley’s call for a more diverse image of Soviet policy in the 1920s is convincing, as is his effort to rehabilitate some of the era’s key Soviet diplomats. One may debate whether the author is somewhat biased towards his protagonists Chicherin and Litvinov, who consistently appear as honest brokers vis-à-vis conservative ideologues and hypocritical imperialists in the Western camp. It will be interesting to see how this discussion unfolds as more scholars gain access to Russian archives to study the legacy of the Soviet Union.

*University of British Columbia*  
Florian Gassner

*British Tank Production and the War Economy, 1934–1945.* By Benjamin Coombs.  
(New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013. Pp. x, 198. $120.00.)

The strength of this book lies in the final third of its pages. The copious notes and extensive bibliography, featuring primary materials from seventeen archives scattered across three continents, give the author credibility. Over one hundred secondary sources clearly augment his command of the subject. The two appendices provide useful summaries of tank characteristics and the production numbers achieved by various British firms. Clearly, substantial effort and attention to detail accompanied this thesis turned monograph.

Unfortunately, the book lacks much in the way of substantial revelations. That production increased post-1936, that obsolete designs continued to be manufactured after Dunkirk, or that tank production always received a lower
priority than the aviation industry all leave the reader uninspired. Even most of the more specific issues, such as the success of the Meteor engine or the continual deficiencies in main armaments, are familiar to World War II scholars and enthusiasts alike. The ultimate conclusion, that “the British tank programme, supported by North American industry, adapted in accordance with the changing strategic situation,” both says it all and does not really say much of anything. It also reflects the author’s tendency to be generous in his conclusions (134). Successes tend to be highlighted within, while failings are typically dismissed as unavailing.

That Britain eventually became dependent on Lend-Lease is, again, common knowledge, but author Benjamin Coombs does post an interesting hypothesis in arguing that Lend-Lease allowed British facilities to shift priorities—for example, from tanks to locomotives—and focus on “quality” production. “Quality” is a relative term, however, and although tanks like the Cromwell and Comet were certainly more reliable than early war models, whether they were much of an improvement on the Sherman or Tiger remains open to debate, comments of Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery notwithstanding. There are other sections of the book that offer occasional insight, such as Canada’s role in perpetuating Britain’s supply of Valentine tanks to the USSR until late in the war. There are also some interesting comparisons, such as the analysis of Britain’s unique challenges regarding the employment and safety of female factory workers. Much of the content, however, reinforces known conclusions.

This book is not scintillating. The small print makes it physically hard to read. The nature of the topic does not lend itself to an exciting narrative. Extensive discussions of bureaucracy would impede even the most avid reader. The author’s prose only worsens the problem. The book reads very much like a thesis. It needed more extensive editing. The verbiage could have been reduced substantially without losing much content or impact.

In the end, one hopes the author received due academic and/or professional credit for his work. It has potential utility as a reference source. It is at times a gallant effort, but it would be hard to recommend this book to anything other than graduate libraries and perhaps libraries within Britain’s industrial belt, especially given its price tag.

Tennessee Technological University

Jeffery J. Roberts

Affiliated with London’s Daily Telegraph, the author of this book is a veteran reporter and author on Middle East conflicts, especially notable for his critically acclaimed biography of Saddam Hussein. In this study, he investigates the historical context to the embattled region studied in Churchill’s first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force [1898], as well as the twenty-first century’s most enduring war. With one exception, the chapter epigrams are taken from Churchill’s contemporary letters and his books Malakand and My Early Life [1930]. The exception is a provocative Pashtun tribe proverb: “You should always kill an Englishman. First comes one as a hunter, then two to make a map, then an army to take the country. So, better to kill the first one.”

Chronic instability in Afghanistan prompted British authorities in India to develop a “forward policy” to forestall Russian influence. This resulted in two costly Afghan wars and a Pashtun tribal revolt in 1897 on the British side of the border, which was focused on Malakand in what is now Pakistan. Thereafter, the British found relative security via negotiated autonomy agreements with the Pashtuns, which independent Pakistan continued after 1947 until the 9/11 attacks. Interest has since focused on Churchill’s time in the same valleys and villages now subject to American drone missile strikes. Churchill viewed Muslim holy leaders as a threat, stating that civilization was in conflict with militant Islam, but he also pragmatically argued that military intervention in Afghanistan is a “poisoned chalice” and financially “ruinous” (38, xxi).

With many far-flung imperial conflicts, British newspapers often used serving officers to file dispatches. Churchill called them “Knights of Pen and Sword” and was himself first under fire as an observer with the Spanish Army in Cuba in 1895 while writing for London’s Daily Graphic. As an officer with the Malakand Field Force, he wrote for the Daily Telegraph and accompanied soldiers as they destroyed villages while looking for illicit British weapons. He personally engaged the enemy and helped rescue wounded soldiers and was thus mentioned in dispatches for gallant conduct. Getting noticed was foremost to him “whether as a writer or a fighter,” and books based upon his journalism were both financially and politically productive (150).

Con Coughlin’s study has merit. There are three maps and thirty-one numbered black-and-white photographs to set the scene, plus a detailed index, bibliography, and endnotes. Unfortunately, the subtitle “War with the Afghans” is
a misleading publisher’s gimmick as operations were in the area of Pakistan known then as the “Northwest Frontier.” Additionally, the enemy were not “Afghans” but the above mentioned Pashtuns; Malakand was not out of print before 9/11 as there was a popular 1990 Norton edition; Lord Randolph Churchill was never a “Tory peer”; Churchill attended the Royal Military College, not the Royal Military Academy; and it was an Egyptian garrison, not a British one, that was massacred at Khartoum in 1885.

_Catholic University of America_  
William John Shepherd


With this volume, Prometheus Books offers an English translation of the late Karlheinz Deschner’s [1924–2014] polemic _Mit Gott und den Faschisten: Der Vatikan im Bunde mit Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, und Pavelić_, which was originally published in 1965. Starting with the title, the bellicose author condemns what he saw as the Catholic Church’s calculated and ruthless collaboration with European fascist regimes as a means to maintain its power and fight communism. In the 1950s and 1960s, writers like Deschner offered valid criticisms of the postwar Catholic Church, which routinely cast itself as a victim of fascism and, in particular, Nazism. The author is on the mark when he accuses supporters of the church, such as the historian Bishop Johannes Neuhäusler [1888–1973], of distorting the historical record of the Catholic Church under Nazism. He correctly points out that the German episcopate never resisted Hitler but focused mainly on protecting its own narrow interests. It is also true that German bishops publicly supported Hitler’s war of aggression in pastoral letters and sermons.

But, alas, whereas Deschner caused a tempest in his day, this new edition will most likely not cause so much as a stir, as contemporary readers will not learn anything new here. The book shows its age in its dearth of archival sources, as the author relies mainly on historical newspapers and select secondary works. More importantly, however, Deschner continually undermines his credibility with sensational, polemical statements about a merciless church determined to maintain its power along with the “money rain” at all cost (24). For instance, he depicts the Spanish Catholic Church on the eve of the Civil War as a pitiless and capitalistic institution that “let the people go to rack and ruin”
Deschner, who clearly subscribed to an idealized view of communism, blames the church for starting the Civil War, for entering into a “beautiful association with German and Italian Fascists,” and for inventing a communist threat in Spain to justify a “three-year bloodbath as a cruzada against the ‘godless’” (70).

The now-familiar argument that the Catholic Church collaborated with fascist regimes “with the aim of a mutual fight against the Soviet Union” also dominates his discussion of Pope Pius XII’s [r. 1939–1958] controversial conduct during World War II and the Holocaust (169). But Deschner’s portrait of a commercialized church and a calculating Pius XII corresponds more closely to the fictional account found in Rolf Hochhuth’s 1963 play The Deputy than to historical truths. This one-dimensional portrayal of Pius XII, along with the argument that the Vatican sided with fascism as a means to fight communism, has been successfully challenged in more recent scholarship, and readers seeking to better understand the Vatican’s collaboration with fascist regimes and its silence during World War II and the Holocaust should invest in a more current monograph on the topic. The English translation of Deschner’s work, on the other hand, will be mostly of interest to students of the “Pius Wars” and the postwar historiography of the Catholic Church under fascism.

Bluffton University
Martina Cucchiara


Judging this book by its jacket—with a buxom, eighteenth-century pickpocket taking advantage of her debauched male companion—would be an understandable mistake. One can imagine the staggering disappointment of the armchair criminologist who grabs this tome based on this image only to find out, many pages later, that it is really a respectable study of female criminal cases in the 1700s. Gregory Durston consciously sets his study of provincial women in England against those who claim to discover national trends from London-based records like those of the Old Bailey. Although other historians pretend that London is “everything,” Durston convincingly argues that the metropole does not provide the perfect sample of the nation as a whole (1–8).

In his chapter on prosecution and punishment, the author agrees with the conclusions of other historians of crime that women found kinder treatment
under the English justice system than their male counterparts; however, he is quick to point out that it was not due to some sophisticated concept of “chivalry” so much as their being perceived as being a lesser threat by judges and juries (40–110). In this survey of the usual suspects of homicide and assault along with the gendered crimes of infanticide and abortion, he provides carefully researched accounts and case studies that help to redefine our metropole-centered views of these crimes (111–208). The author compares provincial rates of homicides committed by women to the modern figure of around 10 percent of total homicide defendants (122). It is interesting that he leaves infanticide out of these figures. Infanticide and abortion garner their own separate chapter. By parsing out the crime of infanticide from general homicide, the argument that women are less violent than men seems more statistically sound (153). Durston’s examination of female property crime also supports the notion of “women as less violent.” And yet his conclusion that such crimes were “often opportunistic and as a result involved items of small to middling value” could be said of much male crime as well (252).

The overall argument is that provincial female criminals were less violent than criminals who were men and tended less toward professionalism in crime. This argument proves convincing until Durston’s discussion of arson and coining. Although mother-daughter teams were more common than large gangs, coining especially attests to the relative ability and inclination of women in the 1700s to be professional criminals (259–262). The patient reader (having overcome the expectations of the Hogarth illustration on the front) is rewarded with the author’s clear comeuppance for historians of gender who equate criminality with female agency: “Some modern academics seem to view lower levels of female offending as a badge of shame, rather than being creditable” (264). Durston concludes that women outside of the London and Middlesex court systems were less violent, were treated with “some indulgence” by the justice system, were not inclined to be hardened professionals, and were less murderous than men in the 1700s (268).

University of Kentucky

Tammy Whitlock


After a short excerpt from the Gospel of Luke (in Church Slavonic!) and a personal introduction, the author of this book opens her study with a provocative
A reader might expect a gauzy description of believers in church, or perhaps an anti-Semitic rant from a skinhead thug with a cross tattoo. Instead, Geraldine Fagan introduces us to Russian Molokans, a homegrown form of Christianity. She pivots quickly to Piotr Orlov, a Russian Old Believer who says, “If God continues to permit everyone on this sinful Earth to exist, then we can’t insist that they all be of the same faith.” With these words, Fagan posits the possibility of a native Russian form of religious freedom, something different from American, British, or Scandinavian models. By beginning the volume with a vignette from 1805, Fagan also highlights the importance of both imperial- and Soviet-period Russian history to religious policy debates.

Covering the period from 1992–2012, Fagan organizes her study into eight chapters, beginning with “Russia’s religious freedom tradition,” the first post-communist bloom of religious freedom, and politicians’ refocus toward Russia’s “traditional religions” (Orthodox Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism). The putative defense of poorly defined “traditional religions,” however, has slid easily toward policy against “totalitarian sects” that could include Baptists, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and proponents of Muslim “Wahhabism.” Fagan concludes with a generally pessimistic description of the present day but closes with the words of Russian Duma representatives in 1906. Shortly after the 1905 Act of Toleration, parliamentarians called for full freedom of conscience to “restore that trust and moral connection between separate peoples” as the prerequisite for the regeneration of the Russian Orthodox Church (200).

Fagan’s central chapters illustrate the wayward path that religious policy has followed in post-Soviet Russia. It is hard not to focus on the major players, especially the president of Russia and the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church. Yet Fagan wisely differentiates among Kremlin-level decisions, regional situations, and the unruly application of laws (be they restrictive or liberating). At times, the text seems to meander from place to place, and from one sacred tradition to another, without clear explanation or transition. This makes Fagan’s argument a little difficult to follow, but it also accurately portrays the phenomenon she studies: more “bureaucratic obfuscation” than “concordat-style agreements.” Her description of “telephone law” is particularly important—any statute may be subverted or endorsed by a well-placed telephone call that leaves, alas, no paper trail (84–92).

Emphasis on religious policy leaves the author little space to analyze the historical processes and personal narratives at play in post-Soviet Russia. After all, Russia’s relationship with religion has been bizarrely unique in modern history. It may be decades before we can answer the most significant question hanging over this book: how might Russia—first steeped in religion and then baptized
into belligerent secularism—create an appropriate and workable form of religious pluralism? Fagan shows little sympathy for Russia’s political system but hints at her deep affection for Russia’s many, and varied, religious believers.

*University of the Sciences*  
Roy R. Robson


This book begins with a puzzle: a lavish manuscript initial, with fine detail and gold, but at its core the figure of a seated scribe left in outline. The accompanying text is badly mangled; the initial itself is a wrong one, and the incipit that follows is a mess. In this study, the author argues that the incomplete initial deliberately signals recognition of the blunder.

Rejecting the usual division assumed between scribe and author, Matthew Fisher reimagines the role of scribes in shaping vernacular historical writings in late medieval England, stressing their role as careful readers, correctors, and engaged writers, not merely copyists. He argues that much editorial convention (stressing “original” text and variants) is consequently wrongheaded for texts of this type and the stereotype of the careless, error-prone scribe often a red herring. Fisher recognizes “duplicative” and “replicative” copying (where accurate transcription is central) but concentrates on “derivative” texts, produced as scribe/authors adapted, rearranged, and redirected material to create genuinely new narrative work. After a chapter on scribal practice and editing issues, he discusses the tradition of creative use of source texts by English historians, particularly Henry of Huntingdon, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and Matthew Paris. The final two chapters look at the work of the Harley scribe and Scribe 1 of the *Auchinleck Manuscript*, analyzing both the two scribes’ creative (and quite different) versions of *The Short Chronicle* and the overall ensemble of their manuscripts, each reflecting a network of sources and a very specific context.

Fisher makes an engaging, largely persuasive argument, although it may be more novel for literary scholars than for historians long familiar with examples like the various forms of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Matthew Paris reworking inherited *St. Albans Chronicle* material into something really his. The book is full of fascinating examples of how scribes/authors reshaped material in large and small ways to reflect particular concerns, some local or in response to current events, and about the technology of manuscript production. The notes are a treasure trove for further reading.
In a book about writing history, Fisher almost seems not to anticipate that his reader might be a historian (or general reader) rather than a literature scholar. The literary jargon is heavy and sometimes tiresome even when intelligible, which occasionally it is not. Fisher translates long Latin quotes, but untranslated Anglo-Norman French and even Middle English passages (of which there are a lot) are not necessarily easily read by nonspecialists and could be daunting to students who otherwise could enjoy and gain a great deal from his approach. Nor is it clear why he terms texts like The Short Chronicle “historiographical.”

Although the question falls outside the boundaries of the project Fisher set for himself, it would be interesting to know to what extent the pattern he sees works in other parts of Europe and, if not, why late medieval England was different.

This is a handsome book with helpful black and white figures, color plates from key manuscripts, and a wonderful cover with an enlarged detail of that incomplete initial that is Fisher’s starting point.

Berea College

Katherine Christensen


This study is subtitled “A Life in Music,” and it lives up to that billing. Although it was first published in German in 2012, it is symptomatic of the way historians and musicologists treated the Richard Wagner bicentennial in 2013. As polarizing a figure as the composer was and remains, this is not a very polemical book. Martin Geck, who has previously published long biographies of Bach and Schumann as well as a short synoptic one of Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, explores Wagner’s achievements but without the rhapsodic tone of the besotted Wagnerian or the prosecutorial affect that suffuses the works of so many of Wagner’s more critical fans.

Wagner and the Wagner clan constantly aestheticized and mystified their own lives, and Geck therefore insists that work and person as well as intention and practice are inseparable. Rather than trying to reconcile the horrific anti-Semitism of Wagner’s 1851 essay on “Judaism in Music” and the music, by declaring it either beside the point or the key to Wagner’s oeuvre, the author is attuned to the complexity and ambiguity in both. Rather than indict or defend Wagner, like Theodor Adorno or Hans Mayer did in the 1950s and 1960s or as Marc Weiner and Dieter Borchmeyer have done more recently, he assumes a
problematic and largely unpalatable Wagner as a given and then focuses mostly on the man’s output.

That is both a good thing and a bad thing. There is no more question of what in Wagner is worth saving or condemning. Instead, Geck presides over the details of life and work with diligence and magnanimity. The reader gets a less skewed and partial view of Wagner than in portraits provided by more partisan writers, but the result also is not a book on Wagner that one could sink one’s teeth into (for that, readers may want to consult the biography of Winifred Wagner by Brigitte Hamann, a wonderful book one reads with clenched fists).

This biography will endure precisely because of its evenhanded view and its scrupulous yet synoptic treatment of Wagner’s life, although the fine translation by Stewart Spencer will do its part as well. A neophyte may be a bit confused to start a biography that gets to the first opera after about ten pages and that devotes as much time to each of Wagner’s early projects as to his entire childhood and family, which was itself tortured and chaotic in a distinctly Wagnerian manner. But this is, as the subtitle promises, a portrait of a life lived through music—one that was never as successful, as confounding, as gallant, or as interesting as when it was lived through music or thinking about music.

In the end, Geck has provided a biography that is as much about reception as it is about a life. It is also about Wagner’s reception of himself, his incessant self-mystification, and his obsessive rewriting of opera and of life. It is less about the person whose picture is on the cover and more about the picture itself. Why has Wagner continued to matter to us?

In a way, though, Geck also offers an eloquent though implicit rebuttal of his own guiding thesis: Has Wagner continued to matter to us in the same way? The debate over Wagner in 1963, when he turned 150, was controversial, scurrilous, hyperbolic, and alive. Today the once-heated debate over Wagner has cooled down, no matter how much the German *feuilleton* tried to stoke one for most of 2013. In the United States, meanwhile, there was not much of a debate at all as everyone got on with it and staged the operas.

Geck’s biography is a symptom of why this is so. He does not choose between a horrid anti-Semite and a musical genius because he does not have to. He shows us an anti-Semitic musical genius, a genuinely terrible man with a genuinely brilliant musical imagination, a man who registers the most rapturous promises and the most rancorous hatreds in the ideologies of the nineteenth century.

---

*Stanford University*

Adrian Daub

This monograph is a helpful exploration of the justification for the continuation of the episcopate and episcopal authority in the reformed Church of England. The author concludes that bishops needed to defend their roles at almost every stage in the early modern period, and they did so using many different arguments and approaches. Episcopacy was often at the heart of the debates about whether the Anglican Church was reformed enough or not. In their efforts to justify their positions and bolster their authority, bishops usually maintained that they were needed to regulate and administer the reformed Church. In order to fend off the charge of popishness, they cited precedents of the apostolic period as well as examples of godly bishops who came before them (and sometimes even before the Reformation). Further, bishops contended that they were important managers and regulators in reforming the Church in appropriate ways. They also continued to wear episcopal vestments and argued that these were indifferent (not forbidden, though not sanctioned, by scripture) signs of authority, not to mention direct representatives of the monarch, who was head of the Church. The focus of this study is on the bishops themselves, which may be why the author does not make recourse to the “no bishop, no king” arguments of James I and other monarchs.

One of the most interesting and unique chapters deals with the attempts of bishops to repress exorcisms in the Jacobean period. Marcus Harmes uses only a few major incidents as his primary evidence, but these do indeed seem to back up his claim that bishops were trying to reserve for themselves ecclesiastical authority. The exorcists flouted that authority.

Harmes demonstrates a deep knowledge of the historiography and acknowledges the complexity of the issues of labels and party identification, yet he carves out a unique niche by approaching the questions from different angles and overlooked approaches. He most often uses case studies to prove his points. So, for example, he devotes a chapter to Archbishop William Laud’s attempts to defend himself against the charges brought against him. Harmes argues that Laud had to answer more for episcopal authority than he did for Arminianism. He makes important points, though he may deemphasize the significance of the issue of Arminianism more than necessary in the process.

Because of his dependence on case studies, Harmes leaves himself open to criticism about the generalization of his points. He may also occasionally overreach
in his arguments, but overall it is hard to dispute his major contentions—they are, after all, quite general in scope. He concludes:

But to the end of the seventeenth century, episcopal identity remained shifting and uncertain. Bishops were required to be different things, to be victims, champions and defenders, as well as apostolic and contemporaneous, and the history of the first one and a half centuries of reformed English episcopacy suggests nothing so much as dogged survival in the pursuit of an intensely desired identity. (121)

Grand Valley State University

Jeff Chamberlain


The author of this book was a faithful courtier of the Iron Lady for thirty years, until her death in 2013. In the 1980s, he was director of the Conservative Research Department, a member of the Prime Minister’s Policy Unit, and one of her speechwriters; in the 1990s, he ghostwrote her memoir, The Downing Street Years [1993]. His new semi-authorized biography covers Thatcher’s entire life and career, unlike the first volume of Charles Moore’s fully authorized biography, Margaret Thatcher [2013], which stops at the Falklands War in 1982. The book is a fast-paced, readable, and informed account of Thatcher’s rise and fall. It is more a polemical memoir than a history, however, based largely on Robin Harris’s personal experiences and on autobiographies penned by cabinet colleagues. It is a warts-and-all account, with the warts hidden by makeup. As early as the preface, Harris declares that “she was the only great British Prime Minister of modern times” (4). Yet if he eschews balance, Harris also paints a believable picture of a relentlessly driven, disruptive, right-wing radical.

Harris also contributes to the contentious, ongoing postmortem on Thatcher and Thatcherism. First, the successful campaign to secure the Conservative Party leadership in 1975 is seen as revolutionary—upending the existing party hierarchy—and a moment when Thatcher showed her undoubted courage. Second, Harris underlines Thatcher’s abhorrence of the way senior civil servants accepted national decline. The exception was Sir Nicholas Henderson, whose 1979 ambassadorial dispatch chimed with Thatcher’s view that British economic decline had accompanied retreat from international power. She was steely determined to change both. Third, Harris sees proto- or full-blooded Thatcherism as a coherent
strand of her entire career, unlike Charles Moore, who sees Thatcher as an adherent of the postwar economic consensus until at least 1974. Fourth, Harris argues that despite the perfect storm of the “poll tax,” a deteriorating economy, and divisions over Europe, the leadership battle in 1990 need not have been fatal. She was ill-served by an incompetent campaign staff and treated shabbily by those who owed her greater loyalty. This view conveniently ignores the degree to which her cabinet had lost confidence in her political touch and resented her imperious behavior. Finally, Harris gives an extended account of the twenty-five years that followed her political ouster. He does his best to put a positive spin on her malevolent undermining of successor John Major, most notoriously over Europe, and even defends the indefensible—her campaign to release former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, arrested in London in 1998 for crimes against humanity. Unfortunately, the book has a gaping hole that is first revealed halfway through the book where, at the close of a chapter on economic policy, in which Harris justifies the decimation of the British manufacturing industry (with 2.6 million job losses) as a needed shakeout of overmanning, he poses the question: “w[W]ere the social costs greater than the economic gains?” (251). He postpones the answer until the final chapter. It could hardly be less convincing when it comes. Did Thatcher create greater inequality? She was not looking to create a more equal society. Did she increase poverty levels? It is impossible to know, but she always believed the causes of poverty were behavioral. Harris then gives the game away: “Mrs. Thatcher did not have a social policy as such.... One can argue that her government was rather too interested in the economy, not enough in society” (439). Yes, one can. The impact of her campaign to rid Britain of socialism was a manufacturing base hollowed out and entire towns broken, many of them still picking up the pieces. If more evidence were needed of Thatcher’s destructive and divisive legacy, it came on 17 April 2013, when the counterpoint to her London obsequies came from the street parties of unemployed in former mining communities.

University of Kansas

Victor Bailey

_Recovering Disability in Early Modern England_. Edited by Allison P. Hobgood and David Houston Woods. (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 2013. Pp. viii, 224. $52.95.)

The editors of this volume have put together an interesting and important collection of essays. The field of premodern disability studies is growing, providing
scholars a new window on all corners of society—the wealthy, the poor, the religious, the medical, and many others. Allison Hobgood and David Woods bring together many talented new scholars in this area, working on literary images of disabilities in early modern English sources. This volume “recovers disability in the English Renaissance by exploring the link between representation and embodiment” (7).

The editors begin by considering the various “models” of disability studies. The retracing of the models has become rather pro forma in disability studies, in part because modern formulas for studying “difference” do not work wholly for the premodern world. Hobgood and Woods do an excellent job in this. Their introductory chapter alone would make an excellent introduction into the field or for a course on disabilities.

The chapters are a little uneven in quality. Some do not situate their topics well, assuming knowledge of particular literary texts on the part of the readers. Nevertheless, the volume’s chapters are all well researched and focused. This reviewer would have liked to see more references to other works in premodern disability studies in the notes, but that may be the reviewer’s own bias as a medieval historian. Still, this work has many excellent articles that are not to be missed.

Sara van den Berg’s article on dwarves in Spenser’s _Faerie Queene_ is wonderfully engaging though sensitive to the topic. Describing one of her main points, she writes, “The dwarf serves not only as the lady’s confidant but as her erotic agent” (36). Van den Berg does a good job of leading her readers to the conclusion that dwarves in Spenser’s stories became confidants—of both the heroine and the audience—as well as the embodiment of sexual play and desire.

Simone Chess’s superb article on blindness challenges her readers to set aside the constructed notion of blindness as a metaphor—that which gives substance to abstract ideas—and instead examine literal blindness (105). She describes several instances of blindness in a variety of texts ending with the tale of a blind beggar who self-identifies as blind and yet “can see his daughter’s beauty and worth,” recalling that premodern contradiction of opposites: when the blind see more clearly than the sighted or the fool speaks more truth than a wise man (117).

There are many other important articles in this collection, including Emily Bowles’s chapter on fetal defects, David Turner’s timely piece on disability humor, and another good essay on Spenser and disability by Rachel Hile. Overall, this is a fabulous addition to the field of premodern disability studies covering many pertinent topics on disabilities, including intellectual disabilities,
blindness, and disability persona—both real and affected. Pitched at such a level as to be understood by the advanced undergraduate, this volume will also be of much use to scholars of early modern England and of premodern disability studies.

Georgia Regents University

Wendy J. Turner


Profound and saintly prophet or fanatical and murdering ideologue? Leon Trotsky has gotten mixed reviews over the years, including among historians and biographers. Along with Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, he was a central organizer of Russia’s 1917 revolution—putting into power democratic councils (soviets) of workers and peasants that soon degenerated into a dictatorship of the Communist Party. Overwhelmed by foreign hostility and civil war during 1918–1921, the regime was saved largely through Trotsky’s efforts to organize a new Red Army and lead it to victory. Along with Lenin and other revolutionaries, he was a founder of the new Communist International, seeking to advance working-class socialist revolutions throughout the world.

As a fatally ill Lenin lay dying amid the wreckage of the young Soviet Republic, a powerful current headed by Joseph Stalin initiated a set of developments that would dislodge the preeminent Trotsky. Stalin, at the intersection of two apparatuses (the Communist Party and the Soviet state), represented an immense bureaucracy determined to preserve its power and privileges while modernizing—soon with extreme brutality—the new Soviet society. The task of “building socialism in one country” sidelined what some in the apparatus viewed as unrealistic hopes of world revolution. Trotsky led an opposition against the bureaucracy in defense of the revolution’s original ideals and was crushed, arrested, sent into Siberian exile, and finally thrown out of the country in 1929.

In this meticulously researched study, Oddvar K. Høidal explores the story of Trotsky’s final exile. The first years in Turkey were relatively tranquil, allowing Trotsky to complete an autobiography and his three-volume _History of the Russian Revolution_. Eager to be in the thick of things in the tumultuous 1930s, he was able to gain entry to France—where a frightened government quickly moved to deport him. The electoral triumph of a socialist-minded Labor Party in Norway brought an invitation, which Trotsky eagerly accepted. Høidal, who explains that “as someone who admires democratic government, [he does] not
share Trotsky’s Marxist ideology,” offers a balanced account of what happened next (x).

Despite protests from Quisling’s fascists and pro-Stalin Communists, Trotsky was welcomed by many on the Left, and he was able to write his classic analysis of Stalin’s USSR, The Revolution Betrayed. Then the story grows dark. Stalin initiated murderous purges, with prominent Communists who had once resisted Stalin’s policies now “confessing” they were part of a traitorous conspiracy led by Trotsky. The Labor government’s “socialism” was hardly that of its intransigent revolutionary guest. Its moderate leaders, feeling immense pressure from its powerful Soviet neighbor and worried about Trotsky’s radical influence, quickly clamped down, placing him under a form of house arrest before expelling him from the country. Høidal makes obvious reference to Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen’s classic Enemy of the People.

Trotsky found refuge in Mexico, continuing his struggle until murdered by the Soviet secret service in 1940—a story well-told in Bertrand Patenaude’s Trotsky: Downfall of a Revolutionary, which is almost a companion volume to Høidal’s fine study.

La Roche College

Paul Le Blanc


In her comparison of English colonization in early modern Ireland and the Albemarle Sound/Chesapeake Bay region of North America, the author of this volume challenges the standard textbook assertion that the English experience in Ireland served as a model for the failed Roanoke colony and the ultimately successful Virginia one. Based on her analysis of archaeological excavations and period documents, Audrey Horning contends that there were “significant divergences between the processes and experience of British expansion in both lands” and that decoupling them “allows for a deeper consideration of the ambiguities of early modern colonialism” (viii). She argues that before 1650 in both locations indigenous people had close contact with English colonizers and shaped their culture, that English colonization of Ireland and America between 1550 and 1650 was synchronistic and competitive, and that events occurring after 1650 have shaped Irish and American identity in ways that distort popular and scholarly interpretations of this earlier period.
Horning develops these arguments in four substantive chapters, two focusing primarily on Ireland and two centered on North America. The initial chapter examines the reactions of Gaelic and Old English Catholic elites to the sixteenth-century Reformation and Tudor conquest of Ireland, which ranged from “full collaboration to outright violent resistance” (99). The second details the sophisticated culture of contact-era Algonquians in coastal North Carolina and Virginia and their early interactions with the English. Evidence in these chapters buttresses Horning’s claim that the proximity of England and Ireland, centuries of familiarity, a shared Christian heritage (despite divisions introduced by the Reformation), and a mutually comprehensible language (Latin) distinguished the English experience in Ireland from the North American one. She also demonstrates that Gaelic Irish and Algonquian cultures “cannot be considered as more than superficially similar” (175).

Chapters 3 and 4 address the relationship between the Ulster Plantation and the Jamestown Colony and support Horning’s claim that these seventeenth-century “Irish and New World ventures were linked, not as model and mirror, but as competitive, contemporary ventures” (270). The Virginia Company of London received its first charter in 1606, just two years before the king compelled some of the London livery companies to support the Ulster Plantation. Before 1650, the two enterprises competed for funding, resources, and even settlers, although before mid-century, transplantation was less successful in Ireland than in Virginia. Some Englishmen spent time in or had families in both places. Attempts to impose English models, especially the creation of towns, took place in both but with more success in Ulster than in Virginia. Still, Horning sees the persistence of Gaelic culture in the architecture and construction of buildings in Ireland and maintains that in some locales close contact between Gaelic Irish and planters continued until the Rising/Rebellion of 1641. Although Virginia differed from Ulster in the incidence of disease and death among the colonizers, before the Powhatans’ attack on the colonists in 1622, Jamestown’s settlers also interacted closely with indigenous people, incorporating aspects of Algonquian material life (food, ceramics, and possibly dwelling houses) into their own. After their defeat in 1644, Virginia Algonquians maintained their cultural identities, although their influence on the material life of the colony became more subtle and interactions with the English more circumscribed.

Horning supports her three major conclusions with a wealth of detailed evidence grounded in deft analysis of material and documentary sources; however, as a historian, the reviewer found herself wishing for less detail and a more
streamlined presentation of the argument. The interpretive context for the relationship between history, memory, and identity also might have been more fully fleshed out, especially since some of these conclusions are bound to be controversial. Nevertheless, Horning has given scholars of Ireland, Virginia, and the British Atlantic a thought-provoking book that complicates their understanding of the interactions between natives and newcomers in Ireland and America and of the relationship between these two English colonial endeavors.

DePaul University

Gail S. Terry


This is a book written for a popular audience by two self-styled royal historians. It describes the court of Emperor Franz Josef, the romance of Franz Ferdinand and Sophie, their morganatic marriage, and their exclusion, even humiliation, by the emperor and those around him. It concludes with the double assassination at Sarajevo and the funeral arrangements that followed. The latter were carefully arranged to distance the emperor and court from both victims.

The odd interview with a Habsburg scion aside, the sources are all secondary, and little informed judgment has gone into their selection. Citations and arguments are drawn from popular accounts, long-discredited scholarly ones like Sidney Fay’s book on the origins of World War I, and more recent respectable works. The book is well written and will certainly sustain the interest of those fascinated by court life. Other readers may be amused, as was this reviewer, by the foreword by Sophie von Hohenberg and her belief that she is entitled to estates confiscated after 1918 by the Austrian and Czechoslovak states. The authors give her claims credence.

To the extent that there is any historical argument of the book, it is conventional and ill developed.

Dartmouth College

Richard Lebow


Full of material that illuminates fascinating corners and major issues in late-Muscovite Russia, the author’s latest book is the definitive source for
information on witchcraft and witch trials in the seventeenth century. Specialists on Muscovy or witch hunts will learn much from *Desperate Magic*. Valerie Kivelson notes that Russia’s social and political hierarchy afforded some protection to people at every level, at least in theory. But the system also produced “harsh conditions of abusively enforced patriarchy, bondage, and social inequity” (6). Magic offered even those in high positions some hope of amelioration. Witchcraft served to “patrol ... norms and obligations ... and to some small degree rein in” arbitrary use of power (8).

Scholars of Muscovite witchcraft have long known that it did not fit the classic West European paradigm of, as the educated elite saw it, recruitment by Satan of lowly folk who then carried out his evil wishes. In Russia, spells and charms written on paper, herbs, and grasses tied into knots, and demonic possession dominated the scene. Satan did not figure in Russian trials until the time of Peter the Great, who was influenced by Swedish ideas.

Kivelson has catalogued and analyzed extant court records for the seventeenth century, amounting to 227 cases from 1601 to 1701. She finds that it was dangerous to be free—that is, without a legal protector of some sort, for example a serf owner—or to be literate, unless reading and writing were part of one’s officially sanctioned duties; freedom or literacy might draw suspicion of evil activity. Although the Muscovite numbers were much lower than in Western Europe, where current estimates put executions at 30,000–40,000, the cruelty of Russian trials equaled those of German practice. Russian officials referred cases to central offices or the tsar himself for instructions; the usual answer was to torture “without mercy” (37). Accusers, too, were often tortured. Was Muscovite torture an effort to find the truth or an exercise of unlimited, arbitrary power over helpless victims? Kivelson unhelpfully argues the point both ways.

About 14 percent of the accused are known to have been executed—also a lower figure than in most Western hunts—but accounts of torture indicate the severity of the Russian story. Gender figures in the trials in certain ways, especially regarding house servants, yet three-fourths of the accused were male, which was more or less the reverse of the Western pattern. Nor was Russian witchcraft often linked to heresy. One similarity across the continent that does stand out is that village healers, which the author calls sorcerers, operated widely in Russia and were tolerated—as long as they did not fall under suspicion of trying black magic, *maleficia*.

Kivelson has read widely but somewhat problematically in the literature on Western hunts. For example, she cites Alan MacFarlane’s notion that
 impersonal social change in England led villagers to scapegoat beggars and charge them with witchcraft. But MacFarlane later completely rejects his earlier analysis. Carole Karlsen’s book on Salem, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman* [1987], maintains that Puritans disdained women in general and especially those who stood to inherit lands; this view cannot explain why a witch hunt occurred in Salem only in 1692-1693 or why prominent Massachusetts ministers denounced the trials and demanded that they end in October 1692. Kivelson writes about “European” practices in the hunts, yet few occurred in Portugal or Italy, though the Parlement of Paris reviewed all accusations in its jurisdiction by 1624 and denounced them as unacceptable in the 1640s.

Kivelson mentions Brian Levack’s emphasis on hunts as part of state building in the West, but does not develop it, probably because the Russian state was already solidly established. Nowhere, incidentally, did an accuser say that he was using the charge of witchcraft to build state authority, cow uppity women, instill social discipline in the villages, or to do anything except pursue evildoers. This appears to be the case in Muscovy as well. Kivelson acknowledges a fear of witchcraft throughout society; use of herbs and spells in certain ways was perceived as a threat to social order and authority.

Nevertheless, Kivelson makes the reader think more about how hierarchy and protection worked in Muscovy and when and how they failed to keep social order. Meanwhile, there is yet another trail of broken lives to consider in Russian history.

*Miami University*

Robert W. Thurston

---

*The Readers of Novyi Mir: Coming to Terms with the Stalinist Past.* By Denis Kozlov. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. 442. $55.00.)

During the early years of what became known as the post-Stalin Thaw, the poet A. A. Akhmatova grimly observed: “Now that the [political] prisoners are returning, the two Russias will look each other in the eye—those who were imprisoned in the Gulag and those who put them there.” In *The Readers of Novyi Mir*, the author points out that such awkward exchanges were not just restricted to passing encounters in narrow corridors, stairwells, and other public places as the society struggled to come to terms with the Stalin period. Using a case study based on the archives of one of the USSR’s most famous literary journals, Denis Kozlov demonstrates that fictional and memoiristic literature also served as a site for the public discussion of the recent past.
It is, of course, well known that literary works of the late 1950s and 1960s, such as A. I. Solzhenitsyn’s *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*, inspired both anguish and soul-searching, but Kozlov reveals that it was not just at home among friends and family that the readership of such works discussed them. Indeed, it turns out that these readers also wrote insightful essays and personal testimonies about the Stalin years that they then addressed and mailed to the editors of important literary forums such as *Novyi Mir*. For Kozlov, such actions speak to both the liberation of individual conscience and the formation of a public sphere within which Akhmatova’s two Russias attempted to come to terms with one another.

Kozlov begins this rich account by noting that in the Russian tradition, artistic literature has provided a forum for philosophical discussion and debate since the eighteenth century—something stimulated by the country’s historically oppressive political environment. And although this institutional role was limited after 1917 by the Communist Party’s attempt to harness arts and letters for the purpose of indoctrination, the Thaw allowed for a halting relaxation of this instrumentalism. Kozlov begins his study with *Novyi Mir*’s decision to open debate over the need for greater sincerity in literature (and thus less orthodoxy) by publishing an essay by V. M. Pomerantsev in late 1953. Although Pomerantsev’s piece was quite modest in many respects, it inspired widespread discussion that quickly threatened the authorities’ control over the situation. Much the same happened three years later after the publication of V. D. Dudintsev’s *Not by Bread Alone*, a novel whose protagonists struggled to overcome the ossification of the Stalin period.

*Novyi Mir*’s failure to publish B. L. Pasternak’s *Doctor Zhivago* that same year led its author to agree to its publication abroad—a fateful decision that precipitated intense debate at home, especially after Pasternak was nominated for the Nobel Prize. Here Kozlov narrates a fascinating story about how Soviet citizens staked out positions on a book that they could not actually get a hold of to read. In the wake of this affair, *Novyi Mir* attempted to promote a new sense of aesthetics oriented around “authenticity” through the publication of critically minded memoirs. This, in turn, allowed the journal’s editor, A. T. Tvardovsky, to appeal to N. S. Khrushchev for special permission to publish Solzhenitsyn’s famous Gulag exposé.

Kozlov then spends the remainder of the book following *Novyi Mir* through the mid- to late 1960s—particularly the role it played in the Siniavsky-Daniel show trial and subsequent debates over a series of sacred Soviet historical
myths. And although his story of Novyi Mir ends unhappily, with its editors’ censure and dismissal, the author stresses that the forum had successfully revived a literary institution that would again promote critical discussion and debate when M. S. Gorbachev proclaimed a new period of political glasnost in 1987.

As noted above, Novyi Mir’s role in inspiring Thaw-era readers has been well known for years. But Kozlov breaks new ground with the attention that he pays to these readers’ engagement in open, almost public debate. Some of Kozlov’s readers eventually ended up questioning the very underpinnings of the Soviet “experiment.” Others were moved to work within the system to reform state socialism. And of course there were many others who either didn’t enjoy steady access to the journal, didn’t understand what they were reading, or simply didn’t care for the subjects under discussion. But Kozlov is right that the letters in the journal’s archive tell us a lot about Novyi Mir’s most engaged readers and allow him to narrate in fascinating detail how they came to terms with the Stalinist past.

University of Richmond

David Brandenberger

Richer of Saint-Rémi: The Methods and Mentality of a Tenth-Century Historian.

By Justin Lake. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2013. Pp. xii, 321. $69.95.)

The author of this book has already published an excellent English translation of Richer of Saint-Rémi’s History with facing-page Latin text (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, 2011). The book here under review presents Justin Lake’s monographic study of the History and its author. It must be said at the outset that Lake is not a political historian. Accordingly, his discussions of the political context within which Richer wrote and the political events narrated in the History are not very useful interventions. Lake writes as if the only political choice in the period was to be pro- or anti-Carolingian, as if forceful kings were the only perceived solution to political disorder, as if papal claims to judge bishops were uncontested. Such assertions are far from representing the current consensus among scholars. Nor can one follow Lake unquestioningly when he suggests that Richer had access to a “now-lost written source” for Odo’s reign, since his own citation does not fully support the statement; Édouard Favre allows only that Richer may have had access to some contemporary notes or documents that covered a few incidental details, not major events [Eudes, comte de Paris et roi de France, Paris, 1893, pp. 230–233].
Nevertheless, these criticisms aside, Lake has written a fine book, for he is an excellent Latinist and student of tenth-century Latin learning. His analysis of Richer’s rhetorical techniques dramatically changes our understanding of the History and will enable historians to use Richer’s accounts of events more judiciously. Lake also provides an excellent introduction to the new educational programs at cathedral schools like Reims in the later tenth century; explains why contemporaries regarded Gerbert of Aurillac as such an important scholar; reveals the importance of Reims as a center of the new liberal arts curriculum; and identifies a specific nexus of values promoted within late tenth-century cathedral schools that presaged the so-called “discovery of the individual.”

More specifically, Lake documents Gerbert’s more rigorous and systematic teaching of classical rhetoric at Reims, including the diagram he had made (on twenty-six pieces of stitched-together parchment) of rhetorical categories and subdivisions. Richer’s indebtedness to this new fascination for classical rhetoric is everywhere in his History, not least in the way invented speeches anchor his narrative, those speeches following the guidelines of Cicero’s De inventione and its commentary by Marius Victorinus. From Cicero’s De oratore Richer took a distinction between the fundamenta of a narrative and its exaedificatio. Lake shows that much of the falseness scholars have found in Richer’s “facts” is due precisely to his attention to exaedificatio. But in accordance with the rules of classical rhetoric, a narrative did not have to be factually true; it needed to be narratively “plausible”—leading Richer not only to invent speeches but also to create dramatic set pieces and assign motivations, borrowing elements from Hegesippus, Sallust, and Livy, and sometimes reusing particularly good motifs for entirely different events. No one should think of using Richer as a source without reading this book.

University of California, Berkeley

Geoffrey Koziol


The appendix to this magisterial work is entitled “Major Incidents of Genocide and Sub-Genocidal Violence: Rimlands and Near-Regions, 1912–1953.” It lists forty-two incidents of mass exterminatory violence between 1912 and 1938 and fifty more (discussed in this second volume) between 1939 and 1953. All occurred in what Mark Levene felicitously calls the “rimlands,” the ethnically
heterogeneous and geopolitically vulnerable shatter zones where new nation-states and the USSR emerged from the old Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian imperial regimes. Of these post-1938 mass killings, twenty-three were committed by the Nazis and six by Axis regimes, while eleven took place under Stalin. As this implies, an achievement of this work is the close analysis of the Holocaust in its many “discrete if overlapping” parts (81). It is a notable contribution to a new literature that is international in scope, moving the Holocaust out of the sole purview of German and Jewish history, contextualizing it in its age of mass political violence, and including the Eastern Front and Stalinism as central parts of the analysis.

Although this study falls into the comparative genocide genre, it is notable for some refreshingly cosmopolitan features. First, its focus on genocide is embedded in a broad political and geopolitical narrative, analyzing the motivations and practices of many movements and perpetrators. Second, it considers other forms of violence that may or may not be considered genocide either because they did not deliberately or explicitly target groups for extermination or were not ethnically oriented per se. Still, one can question whether Soviet political, social, and class-based violence can be fully treated within Levene’s focus on genocide. That said, after three wide-ranging chapters focusing on the roots of holocaust and world war, Nazi genocide against Jews and Roma, and the non-Nazi perpetrators of the Holocaust, Levene includes an outstanding fourth chapter on the “omnicide” of the military struggle on the Eastern Front. There he considers the “genocidal quality” of nonethnic mass killings in the war of annihilation. The book concludes with a chapter on the Stalinist deportations of “punished peoples” and a thoughtfully disturbing coda on the post-war European and Soviet deportations of ethnic Germans and others that ended the ethnic heterogeneity of the rimlands (240).

This is thus a work of synthesis, but one that marshals an impressively broad, erudite reading of the latest literature on a vast array of movements and events. This reviewer only found a few missteps—such as when the 1940 People’s Commissariat for Interior Affairs (NKVD), far more efficient and seasoned than its SS rivals, is said to have been “in a rather obvious way” a “replay” of Ivan the Terrible’s oprichniki (61, 430 n. 202). As sixteenth-century sources on Ivan are virtually nonexistent, Levene’s source for this assertion is a popular work on Stalin. More broadly, the problem of modernity is not deeply examined (and in another place the NKVD is dubbed the “cutting edge of Soviet high modernism”) (316). But so many other major issues are probed, in a kind of Socratic style that refreshingly examines analytical questions from various
angles, that this is the exception that proves the rule. Levene’s magnum opus is at once interpretive and authoritative.

Georgetown University

Michael David-Fox


In this brief local history, the author attempts to elucidate the ways in which the Great War affected Limerick. His focus is on the role that recruitment into British military service had upon local politics, economics, and, to some degree, society. In the process, the author considers these issues and their role in the waning appeal of John Redmond and the Irish Parliamentary Party as well as its defeat by Sinn Féin in 1918.

Tadhg Moloney opens with a consideration of military recruitment during the Boer War. Even though about thirty thousand Irishmen served between 1900 and 1902, Limerick was not the only part of Ireland to see considerable pro-Boer support amongst Irish nationalists. The Limerick Corporation was one of many local governments giving broad statements of support for the Boers, and this of course complicated the call for recruits. Nevertheless, both loyalty and economic incentives served to draw men into the army.

The recruiting issue was magnified when it came to World War I. With the Home Rule issue, John Redmond offered the services of the National Volunteers. His offer was turned down by the War Office, causing a split within the organization and leading to the founding of the Irish Volunteers. This division had its manifestations in Limerick as the author claims, with little evidence, that Sinn Féin took up the mantle of nonrecruitment, especially the threat of conscription, and gained ground amongst farmers (56). The book follows this assertion by considering the lasting effects of military service on the decline of support for the Irish Parliamentary Party and the increasing support for Sinn Féin and what the author vaguely refers to as “advanced nationalism,” thus maintaining that recruitment, enriched as it was by possible conscription, “fastened the sea change in nationalist support from the Irish Parliamentary Party to that of Sinn Fein” (171).

The author’s overall thesis is that the recruitment debates during the Boer War laid down roots that had effects both in 1915 and later periods. The thesis is not presented well nor is it terribly obvious or well argued. This problem is compounded by a text that is divided into numerous subchapters begging for
more examination. These present tantalizing archival materials, but the effect is a pile of potentially relevant subjects that rarely sustains a coherent line of inquiry. There are also substantial omissions; the Easter Rising’s effects are wholly ignored. And although this work is not meant to be a major exploration of the period, the author has to make compact and broad interpretations of that history at various points; in doing so, he all too often suggests that his conclusions about these are original when in fact the ground has been well developed. Although the author has done much homework, his thesis, as suggestive as it is, remains underdeveloped.

Oakland University

Seán Farrell Moran


The author of this book is a Conservative MP in the House of Commons with an academic background in philosophy. He opens the study with the extraordinary claim (repeated on UK national radio) that “Burke has all but been ignored in recent years” (1). This is a strange claim to make as Oxford University Press’s modern edition nears completion alongside F. P. Lock’s monumental biography, J. C. D. Clark’s extraordinary edition of *Reflections*, and Cambridge University Press’s *Companion*, as well as over a dozen recent monographs, collections of essays, anthologies, and numerous articles—many of which are cited in Jesse Norman’s own bibliography. Paradoxically, part 2 opens with the recognition that “academic interest [in Burke] is greater than it has been for many years” (171)!

Interpretive charity as well as sparse and gestural footnotes suggest the explanation for these perplexing claims is that it is contemporary politicians (and “the public”) who have ignored Edmund Burke and who are being urged to pay him attention. Whether “the public” ignores him more than they do Hobbes, Rousseau, or Hegel is a moot point. But for conservatives, Burke is an authority figure whose views can justify their own by showing that he held the views that they wish to advance as authentically conservative—and that they are authentically conservative because he held them. Norman argues, additionally, that Burke’s views are supported by a considerable amount of recent social science research.

The book is divided into two parts: “Life” and “Thought.” “Life” is a relaxed read for those daunted by Lock’s authoritative work. More original (if distinctly unrevisionist) is part 2, in which Norman, having reviewed Burke’s
posthumous reputation, argues—he thinks in opposition to almost all other readings of his thought—that Burke is not only a systematic thinker but is also responsible for two elements constitutive of modern politics. The first is the concept of stable party-government as a way of focusing coherent policy, checking executives, providing political forums for ordinary citizens, and representing the public’s interests. The second is the modern idea of political leadership as a moral (in the eighteenth-century sense) skill dependent on personal qualities of moderation and empathy. More interesting—from a political point of view—is Norman’s characterization of “liberal individualism” and his account of Burke’s critique of it, which is contrasted with the “social self.” In support of Burke’s view, Norman recruits recent works on the cultural determinants of cognition, including those of Putnam and others on social capital.

Norman writes well, but his touch is not always sure or consistent across the book. He misses a trick or two. Most glaringly, he claims Burke “would have disliked the financial metaphor in the idea of social capital”—forgetting momentarily Burke’s famous deployment of it in Reflections: “We are afraid to put men to live and trade each on his own private stock of reason ... individuals would do better to avail themselves of the general bank and capital of nations and of ages” (257).¹


University of Exeter

Iain Hampsher-Monk


For the British Empire, the First World War was a global conflict, with battles stretching across the broad expanses of Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Pacific. Most historians characterize these events as insignificant sideshows far removed from the carnage of the Western Front. At War in Distant Waters adds a corrective to this view by demonstrating how colonial campaigns and overseas naval actions were central components of a broader British maritime strategy aimed at sustaining international trade. Far from trivial affairs on the periphery of empire, these important operations “protected the empire from the incalculable damage that would have resulted from the loss of trade or economic collapse” (10).
Phillip Pattee makes a convincing case for the importance of trade protection within imperial security concerns. The United Kingdom imported the majority of its foodstuffs, and British-flagged vessels constituted almost half of the available merchant tonnage in the world. Admiralty experts recognized that, in times of war, Germany would conduct an extensive guerre de course campaign against Allied shipping with cruisers and armed merchant ships. British defense administrators responded to this danger with a number of innovative measures, including the creation of a naval intelligence system capable of tracking German warships and merchant vessels and cooperation with private insurance groups to subsidize the expected rise in shipping insurance rates. Upon the outbreak of war, British and colonial forces took immediate offensive action against isolated German colonies, such as Togoland and Samoa. Deprived of their supply bases and points of refuge, German cruisers gradually fell prey to Allied warships or sought internment in neutral ports. The result was a resoundingly successful campaign that largely eliminated Germany’s overseas naval threat by the end of 1914.

Less convincing is Pattee’s focus on British strategic planning in the Edwardian period. The author depicts colonial campaigns as wartime decisions taken by the Committee of Imperial Defence, raising questions about the degree to which these measures factored into prewar considerations. Moreover, he largely overlooks the important role the self-governing Dominions played in imperial strategy. Australia and New Zealand did not merely respond to British overtures to seize German possessions in the Pacific; they developed cooperative schemes for joint expeditionary forces in the years leading up to the conflict. Pattee’s argument is also constrained by the limitations of his archival research, which include important Admiralty and Committee of Imperial Defence files but lack most of the private papers from the principal British and Dominion figures responsible for maintaining imperial security. Despite these limitations, this book nonetheless provides a new perspective on the importance of trade and economics in the formulation of British global strategy.

Samford University

John C. Mitcham


This well-researched and well-written book breaks new ground in our understanding of clerical marriage in the early Reformation and also provides
valuable reading for anyone seeking to understand more deeply the theological, social, political, and gender history of this pivotal period in early modern European history. The author, in a study of more than twenty-five hundred Lutheran pastors from the 1520s to the early 1530s in the dioceses of Mainz and Magdeburg, brilliantly analyzes clerical marriage in the first decades of reform and demonstrates convincingly that these marriages need to be explored not only against the backdrop of the era’s theological debates but also through the lived realities of those women and men who entered into such unions. In addition, she takes seriously the many—and frequently competing—voices of those who weighed in on the legitimacy of such marriages, including ecclesiastical and civic authorities, the relatives of former monastics, and the neighbors and fellow parishioners of clerical families.

At the outset of her work the author lists a number of important questions that she seeks to answer: namely,

how, where, when, and even why did clerical marriage become accepted as a behavioral norm for the clergy; why would monks, nuns, and priests and their sexual partners risk taking the step of marriage when they already had tacit toleration for their households; what were the public and official reactions to the change that marriage implied; and what impact were these changes and the events of public weddings of clergy to have on attitudes to and regulation of marriage, gender, and sexuality? (3)

Individual chapters focus on such topics as the distinctive issues at play when monks and nuns married, the experiences of women in clerical marriages, and the challenges inherent in positing the pastor’s marriage and household as model institutions for the laity.

In the early 1500s, church and civic leadership alike attempted to curb the sexual misconduct of clergy. Whereas the former, however, sought to ferret out such misconduct through the use of increased episcopal visitations, condemnatory statements, and the levying of fines, the latter relied on new legislation intended to reinforce moral norms for the clergy in general and to end the common practice of concubinage in particular. Not surprisingly, it was the most notorious cases of clerical sexual misconduct that drew the attention of authorities and could lead to severe punishments (including excommunication and even incarceration) for both concubine and cleric.

In exploring the reasons why women chose to become the wives of pastors in the 1520s and 1530s, Marjorie Plummer paints a fascinating picture of the experience of concubines, nuns, and middle-class women who stepped into the
role of the pastor’s wife, which in the early years of the Reformation could be an even riskier position to hold than that of concubine. Women in the first generation of clerical marriages had much to lose in marrying pastors: Some were sent into exile, others were imprisoned, and a few were executed. In contrast, the priestly concubines of previous generations—as well as women who entered into clerical marriages after 1530—were less likely to face the social criticism and persecution suffered by this first generation of pastors’ wives.

By the mid–1500s, the pastor’s family assumed the burden of teaching by example: That is, his family was tasked with demonstrating to the laity how the Christian household should be structured and how its members were to function. Civic authorities, who now expected pastors to marry in order to keep their congregational appointments, wanted pastors to be models of paternal authority in their households. In addition, pastors’ wives were to live as upright women deserving of the roles they had now assumed within the community, and their children were to be well behaved and well educated. As Plummer concludes, “the priest’s household, once the exceptional in the community, would now look the same as those of the laity, but with the expectation of presenting the ideal model of Lutheran social piety” (282).

This book offers an expert and fascinating analysis of reform in practice as it richly describes the complicated transition from the late medieval world of clerical concubinage to clerical marriage in a large area of Germany during the early Reformation. The road “from priest’s whore to pastor’s wife” was an uncertain and even dangerous route to a new identity for women of the period, but it was a road that many traveled nevertheless in the early years of the Reformation. We have Plummer to thank for a study that reveals much about these women’s experiences and contributes greatly to our understanding of clerical marriage during this time of profound change in western Christianity.

*Pacific School of Religion*  
Bernard Schlager


The increasing regulation of medieval marriage that began in the early thirteenth century produced a wealth of documentation that has allowed historians significant insights into medieval peoples’ experiences of marriage. However, the fact that research has depended on the records of the episcopal courts,
which held primary jurisdiction over marriage cases, means that though we
know much about some regions (notably England and Italy), many others,
where court records do not survive, remain obscure. Ludwig Schmugge’s
Marriage on Trial applies the author’s decades of experience in the archives of
the papal penitentiary courts to address this deficiency, reading backwards
from over six thousand cases that had originated in German-speaking dioceses
during the second half of the fifteenth century, supplemented with registers
from the few episcopal courts where records have survived.

Schmugge’s research in large part supports the conclusions of historians
working in other, better-documented regions: Although medieval people did
not feel completely bound by the legal rules of marriage, they preferred that
their marriages be canonical, even if it took litigation to make them so. Addition-
ally, the author’s work provides evidence for a level of cooperation between
secular and ecclesiastical authorities that undermines older arguments about
competing models of medieval marriage.

Though marriage litigation necessarily began in the local episcopal courts,
any judgment that entailed an exception to canon law required papal approval.
By the thirteenth century, petitions had grown numerous enough to require a
special office, the papal penitentiary, to handle them. Chapter 1 outlines the
workings of this office, and chapter 2 provides a detailed exploration of the
canon law behind these verdicts. Here, Schmugge’s admirably thorough discus-
sions of procedure, legal context, and archival anatomy will be invaluable to
any researcher embarking for the first time on a study of medieval marriage.
The two subsequent chapters move on to discuss the papal and diocesan cases
themselves. Chapter 3 presents stories from the penitentiary courts that origi-
nated in German-speaking officiality courts, underlining the importance of local
context and arguing for an interest in marriage reform at the local level that
has at times been more associated with the Reformation.

It should be noted that Schmugge has constructed his book according to a
continental model that tends to be more descriptive than analytical, an
approach that may present issues for Anglo-American readers. This source-
driven approach also means that the author refers only obliquely to the second-
ary literature in chapters 3 and 4, often tantalizing readers with an intriguing
point but giving them nowhere to turn for more information. Finally, readers
familiar with the recent literature on litigation and representation will likely be
uncomfortable with Schmugge’s absolute faith in the truthful content of his
sources (168). These methodological critiques, however, should not distract
from the valuable contribution that this book represents. Schmugge’s creative
approach to a gap in the evidence supplies further insight into the function—and frequent dysfunction—of medieval marriage and provides researchers new to the field with an extremely useful foundation that should make this book essential reading for students interested in the subject as well as a valuable addition to the collections of more advanced scholars.

*California State University, Long Beach*  
Marie A. Kelleher

*The Huguenots.* By Geoffrey Treasure. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013. Pp. xi, 468. $35.00.)

This book is an excellent introduction for those coming to Huguenot history for the first time as well as a detailed and coherent overview for those already familiar with the era. It is written in a lively and engaging style and is a very good read. The author weaves a wide range of sources and his own previous research into a readable, substantial, and detailed history that spans almost three centuries, from the reign of Francis I to the end of the eighteenth century.

The five sections of the book chronicle the history of the Huguenots from the first stirrings of the Reformation in Europe to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and its consequences. The study is not a religious history of the Huguenots. Indeed, Geoffrey Treasure devotes relatively little space to the inner life of the French Reformed Church and to the religious debates and disputes that divided it, particularly in the seventeenth century. Rather, he focuses on the social composition and the location of the emerging Huguenot community and on the problems its existence created for a monarchy seeking to increase and consolidate its own authority.

The author allows the reader to follow the conflicts that accompanied the rapid expansion of the French Reformed Church towards the end of the sixteenth century and its loss of military and political power at the beginning of the seventeenth. The author then analyzes the community of the mid-seventeenth century: its social composition, respect for the crown, and gradual decline before its eventual abolition in 1685. The consequences of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes constitute the final section. The numbers, destinations, and contributions of those who departed are evoked briefly. More attention is given to the situation in France, where the economic effects and the latitude offered to those who were important to the state is contrasted with the harsh treatment of those who continued to practice their religion or rise in revolt.

The book does not deal with the Huguenots in isolation but takes considerable care to set the various stages of the development and decline of the
reformed community in France firmly within the context of wider social, political, and religious events, both inside France and within Europe as a whole. To take one example, the author suggests towards the end of the volume that Louis XIV’s decision in 1685 finally to withdraw the tolerance extended to the Huguenot minority in France may well have been an effort to retrieve his position in Catholic Europe, damaged two years previously when he failed to send troops to help defend Vienna against the Turks.

Inevitably in such a broad history, there are omissions, such as the early efforts to reunite the churches in the 1630s. Treatment of the clergy of the mid-seventeenth century is also rather too dismissive. The range of sources used is generally excellent, although limited in one or two chapters. Readers may also wish for more detailed footnotes at times and regret the absence of some very useful French-language source material.

University of Ulster

Jane McKee


Early modern women’s history is an exciting field not only because of the remarkable new work that continues to appear but because its methodology is still developing. The author has contributed significantly to this field through his study of the transition from midwives to male medical practitioners in The Making of Man-Midwifery: Childbirth in England, 1660–1770 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995). In his latest study, Adrian Wilson examines previous interpretations of the rituals of childbirth, including his own, and demonstrates how difficult it is to avoid the pitfalls of traditional history: widespread dependence on larger historical narratives centered on the men, the assumption that women were passive victims rather than agents, and the tendency to focus on events that have produced ample documentary evidence. Instead, in his fourth and final chapter, Wilson pieces together a record, no matter how incomplete, of the acts and interests of women. He argues that the month-long ritual of lying-in during and after childbirth reveals a collective culture of women that resisted the inequities of the marriage system.

Wilson is adept at diagnosing the problems with previous explanations: His own application of Arnold van Gennep’s theory of a “rite of passage” ignores the actual makeup of the ritual. Keith Thomas’s attention to beliefs of female pollution cannot explain the all-female society that happily gathered around the mother nor
the festivities associated with it. Wilson’s meticulous attention to diaries, court cases, licensing regulations, and church publications and practices allows him to construct a very persuasive portrait of an interval when mothers were exempt from conjugal obligations and under the leadership of a midwife. The mother was also surrounded by other women enjoying themselves, and together these women expected a large outlay of financial resources from the husband.

The structure of the book is illuminating, if somewhat problematic. It is clear that Wilson wants to challenge longstanding accounts of marriage as the unmitigated subordination of women and to offer his analysis of lying-in as an alternative. However, his success at challenging previous views of gender relations is uneven. He begins with illegitimacy to explore the social injustices experienced by unwed mothers and argues convincingly that marriage itself provided women with tangible benefits. The second chapter on the “bonds” of marriage claims that there was no consistent belief in the inferiority of women, patriarchy is useless as a model for analysis, and husbands had far less control over wives and family wealth than has previously been assumed.

The third chapter proposes that historians should begin with instances of resistance and unpack from these the nature of gender relations. However, the examples he gives continue to substantiate a very strong norm, no matter how inconsistently stated: Husbands had the final say on money and behavior. Most of his examples come from 1640 and later, and they do not address the authoritarian ideology of the early Stuarts. Although he fails to topple the patriarchal family as a useful model for the period, his fourth chapter proves that his method can be remarkably effective.

Bates College

Cristina Malcolmson

*Bates College*

*English Catholics and the Supernatural, 1553–1829.* By Francis Young. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013. Pp. xii, 308. $134.95.)

A welcome addition to Ashgate’s *Catholic Christendom, 1300–1700* series, this book contributes to the postrevisionary historiography of the English Reformation that has changed our understanding of the confessional identity and religious practice of Catholics in modern England. Francis Young focuses on English Catholics’ diverse and shifting responses to the preternatural from Mary Tudor’s accession in 1553 until the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829. In scholastic philosophy, the category of “preternatural effects”... ranged from the activity of the devil and the demonic operations of magicians to the morally
neutral powers of the human soul,” though it excluded the properly “supernatural” actions of God and his grace (26). Young’s title reflects our contemporary usage of “supernatural” as roughly equivalent to the rarer term “preternatural.”

The book is organized both by topic and period. There is an informative discussion of intra-Catholic disputes about a range of preternatural phenomena. What consistently emerges is a picture of English Catholicism marked as much by internal differences and disputes as by external opposition. The range of Catholic opinions on the existence and significance of ghosts, miracles, and demonic possession blurs rather than underscores the distinction between Catholics and Protestants. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, disagreements among English Catholics about the preternatural partook in the broader struggle between Jesuit and secular clergy for theological and jurisdictional authority in an embattled English Catholic Church. Jesuits were willing to accommodate folk beliefs about the preternatural, especially if doing so aided the conversion of the populace to Catholicism. English secular clergy, by contrast, were more hesitant in this regard, on account of both the English Protestant equation of Catholicism with superstition and an older tradition of English Catholic skepticism regarding the scope and power of the preternatural.

This tension within English Catholicism has been ably explored by others, of course, and part of Young’s own achievement is his judicious documentation and synthesis of this earlier work. The book’s real contribution to the study of English Catholicism is a function of its impressive historical range. By extending his analysis of the preternatural in English Catholicism into the nineteenth century, Young helps us to see recurring patterns in intra-Catholic dispute. The tensions between Jesuits and other clergy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England are structurally homologous to later conflicts precipitated by the French Revolution. In this later period, the enlightened Catholicism of Alexander Pope and others—itself derived from the native skepticism of the old faith—comes into conflict with the ultramontane prerogatives of the members of the Jesuit order, whose vow of obedience to the papacy proves inhospitable to liberal Catholicism. Among other things, then, Young’s fascinating narrative of the preternatural in English Catholicism reveals that competing theological accounts of ghosts, demons, and magic were almost always entangled in competing accounts of the social and political significance of English Catholicism across the longue durée.

Univeristy of St. Thomas, Minnesota

William Junker
This collection of papers is a worthy successor to *The Impact of Hospitals, 300–2000* (ed. Henderson, Horden, and Pastore), which appeared in 2007 by the same publisher. The current collection’s chapters originated in conference papers that share the concept of communities and how they defined themselves through and for their hospital institutions. This thematic thread is, unsurprisingly, more prevalent in some of the essays than others, but as a whole the volume coheres successfully.

The fourteen chapters are grouped into five categories. “Communities and Isolation” examines how plague victims were treated in seventeenth-century Florence (John Henderson) as well as how lepers were treated in early modern Venice (Jane Stevens Crashaw), Crusader Jerusalem (Rafaël Hyacinthe), and late nineteenth- through early twentieth-century Trinidad and Tobago (Rita Pemberton). “Communities and the Poor” considers economics and identity in late medieval England (Carole Rawcliffe), Barcelona (Teresa Huguet-Termes), and Catalonia (Josep M. Comelles), as well as Portugal from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century (Laurinda Abreu). “Hidden or Reluctant Communities” reveals aspects of overlooked caregivers—Catholic religious women in late nineteenth-century England (Carmen M. Mangion)—and vulnerable patients such as lepers on Chacachacare Island in the early twentieth century (Debbie McCollin), as well as enslaved individuals in the antebellum American South (Stephen Kenny). “Communities and War” focuses on regimes and their use of propaganda through hospital treatment in Carlist Spain (Jon Arrizabalaga, Pablo Larraz-Andía, and Guillermo Sánchez-Martínez) and World War I Russia (Peter Waldron). The last category, “Virtual Communities: The Future,” demonstrates concepts and methods of online research in building broad virtual communities that go beyond the bounds of traditional academia (Christopher Bonfield). Although space in this review does not allow discussion of the insights and arguments of each particular essay, the individual chapters are themselves strong contributions to the growing scholarly discourse on hospitals and the history of medicine.

Read together, these essays reinforce several observations highlighted in the introduction: how, even in island communities, isolation of the sick was rarely complete; how care of the sick could enhance or even build community identity through religious, social, and political means; and the ephemeral and even
artificial nature of many of these communities, which often served wider purposes than their founding mandates, but that would most likely have been forgotten without scholarly attention. The communities considered throughout the volume are by no means the same, and the term itself can refer simultaneously to overlapping or competing sub-groups such as administrators, donors, government officials, local populations, and the patients themselves. The differing coalitions of communities within each specific study help highlight possibilities for further inquiry. As the editors’ introduction emphasizes, we each choose and define the communities we wish to research (14). This collection demonstrates the possibilities of wider conversational bounds by its juxtaposition of multiple case studies and opens the door to further fruitful discussion of hospitals and communities.

Brigham Young University

Charlotte A. Sanford


In this impressive synthesis, the author reminds historians of the value of asking big, comparative questions. How do we explain differences in race relations within the nations of Latin America and the United States? How did the laws that governed the slave regimes of the Spanish, Portuguese, and British Empires and the nations that emerged from them shape those differences? Robert J. Cottrol argues that the Roman legal tradition, which provided the foundation for slave laws in Latin America, allowed greater opportunity for manumission, protected the limited rights of slaves, and guaranteed their rights as citizens once they were emancipated. Anglo-Saxon law, by contrast, was hostile to manumission, slave rights, and black citizenship. The legal and social legacy of Roman law facilitated the incorporation of African-descended people into Latin American societies and allowed for limited social mobility in ways that were impossible in the United States prior to 1960. But Cottrol does not conclude—as did Frank Tannenbaum before him—that this made racial attitudes in Latin America more benevolent. He suggests, rather, that racism in Latin America was more ambiguous and therefore more difficult to combat.

Cottrol compares the colonial and national experiences of the United States, Brazil, and nine nations of former Spanish America, including Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, and the Dominican Republic. He divides his study into three parts of three chapters each, with a chapter devoted to each case study. The first part examines the slave regimes of the colonial period; the second, the policies of the nineteenth century that were intended to shore up white supremacy and racial exclusion; and the third, the civil rights movements of the twentieth century.

Cottrol’s major point is that the caste-like system that defined US race relations from the antebellum years through the civil rights movement can be traced to the dissonance between a political ideology of equality and the reality of race-based human bondage. In order to reconcile this contradiction, the US legal system had to justify and maintain the social inferiority of the African American population. By contrast, in Brazil and Spanish America, social inequality was presumed and entrenched. Ironically, the rigidity and visibility of racial segregation in the United States facilitated legal challenges to official policies of race-based exclusion. As a result, it surpassed Brazil and other Latin American nations in the promulgation of civil rights legislation for African-descended peoples. Part of what explains this difference is that in the United States there has long been a social and legal consensus as to what constitutes blackness. Racial identity in Latin America has always been more fluid and ambiguous.

Cottrol’s study is a must-read for students of comparative slavery and race relations. His approach to legal history, which sees law as part of the fabric of society, makes this book appealing to both historians and legal scholars. Students and the general public will find the book accessible and informative.

Emory University


Intelligence history generally falls into one of two categories: racy exposés by journalists aimed at a popular readership or more specialist monographs by academic historians intended for an audience of colleagues or intelligence practitioners. Writers in the first category tend to sacrifice careful research and balanced judgment for readability; academic texts too often consist of dense, dry institutional history.

Fortunately, Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones has long shown that it is possible to transcend these limitations, producing a series of books that combine scholarly
Jeffreys-Jones paints a compelling yet ambivalent portrait of Anglo-American intelligence relations. On the one hand, he shows how the two world wars and the Cold War bred a close partnership between American and British spies. This liaison improved standards of intelligence analysis in both countries, fostered mutual understanding, and helped promote Western security. Although acknowledging the much-vaunted British influence on the development of US intelligence, especially the creation of the CIA, Jeffreys-Jones also explores how, increasingly after the 1960s, American concerns with democratic accountability crossed the Atlantic and liberalized British attitudes toward official secrecy.

Yet there were limits to the intelligence “Special Relationship.” The evident preoccupation of the British with defending their declining imperial position in the world tended to irritate the Americans, just as Washington’s fear of communist expansion sometimes confounded observers in London. There were understandable tensions arising from the discovery of Soviet moles in MI6 such as Kim Philby and, on the British side, concern that American attitudes about open government risked the exposure of joint operations. In recent years, and particularly after the failed search for weapons of mass destruction following the invasion of Iraq, commentators on both sides of the Atlantic have called for the abandonment of the cozy Anglo-American embrace and the forging of new intelligence alliances (Jeffreys-Jones devotes two later chapters to the emergent federal intelligence apparatus of the European Union).

Jeffreys-Jones’s narration of this history is witty, trenchant, and informed by extensive primary and secondary research. Particularly welcome is the attention he pays to broader social and cultural currents—for example, the declining power of Anglo-Saxon elites in twentieth-century America—and the baleful consequences of that decline for the intelligence “Special Relationship.” Another enjoyable aspect of the book is its coverage of spy literature and the overlap between fiction and the real world of intelligence—for example, the CIA’s unsuccessful tasking of E. Howard Hunt (of later Watergate fame) to write a series of spy novels to rival the popularity of the British James Bond.

This is intelligence history at its best, a model for other exponents of the genre, and proof positive that a book can be scholarly and readable at the same time.

California State University, Long Beach
Hugh Wilford

In a well-reasoned analysis, the author of this book describes and explains a decline in military coups over the past eight centuries in certain nations. He describes at length what transpired in “coup-prone” states and contrasts these phenomena with the experience of the first “coup-free” states—Venice, Great Britain, and the United States. He concludes that individual “self-interest” accompanied by “the rule of law” and republican forms of government led to the emergence of coup-free states. Under “the rule of law,” elites “no longer form secluded personal loyalty cabals but rather create loose, open-ended networks of colleagues.” In such relationships, “high-ranking officials do not trust each other enough to conspire at a coup d’état” (9). Thus “the rule of law threatens conspirators with prosecution,” and “the notion of a coup effectively disappears” (72–73). In a final section, author Ivan Perkins suggests some ways the United Nations and the World Economic Forum in Davos might become involved in “educating” public servants in coup-prone states in the advantages of “rule-of-law” anticorruption measures (262–263).

His argument is persuasive, with only a few relatively minor errors. When he writes that “the British military has been well-behaved and solidly constitutional for over three hundred years,” he ignores the Curragh Incident of 1913–1914, when the majority of army officers signaled clearly that they would not obey orders to prevent Sir Edward Carson’s Ulster Volunteer Force from forcefully preventing the Asquith government’s parliamentary grant of Home Rule to Ireland (44).

Elsewhere, he writes that President Andrew Johnson’s request that General William Tecumseh Sherman take command of what would have been a brigade of men “to be based near Washington” was “clearly unconstitutional” and “illicit.” This ignores the fact that Secretary Edwin Stanton, General Ulysses Grant, and the Radical Republicans in the Congress were conspiring to prevent Johnson from replacing Stanton with a secretary of war more amenable to the president’s wishes; and that they, not Johnson, were the ones that, it could be argued, were acting unconstitutionally to deprive the president of his powers as commander in chief.

Perkins fails to recognize that Samuel Finer’s The Man on Horseback provided a substantial portion of what he accomplishes here. Although Perkins is justified in critiquing Finer on his understanding of the military’s side of coup making, he fails to note that Finer’s distinction between “low” and “mature”
political cultures is essentially what this book is describing. He also holds that the reviewer’s own analysis of military coups falls short, yet he fails to note the reviewer’s comparison of the differences in coup rates between authoritarian states and “competitive democracies,” the latter of which were defined as “those enjoying a constitutional right to organize political movements, free speech, press, and assembly, a broad franchise, periodic elections, and independent judges . . . [with] high standards of probity for public officials.”¹ These sure sound like Perkins’s “rule of law” and republican form of government to this reader.

These observations notwithstanding, Perkins’s Vanishing Coup constitutes the best study currently in print on what produces military coups and what prevents them.

University of Pittsburgh

Peter Karsten


In an engaging narrative, the author of this book tells the story of the Hankey, one of a trio of ships that set sail from Britain in 1792 on a journey to Bolama—an island off the west coast of Africa. Unfortunately, it was an endeavor that often suffered at the hands of “poor planning and bad luck” (97). The expedition began with 275 people, but, reduced by disease and desertion, was down to only six when they finally abandoned their cause eighteen months later. Billy G. Smith describes this tale as “an adventure story” that “changed world history,” using the colonists’ collective experience to illuminate the Atlantic trade system in the first half of the book and the Hankey’s post-Bolama travels to the Americas in the second half (ix). Offering lessons in the history of disease and environment within the context of world history, Smith follows the trail of these early British abolitionists and “their failed attempt to establish a free colony in Africa” (ix). But Ship of Death also includes a history of the West African people who encountered these settlers and later follows the Hankey and its role in introducing yellow fever into Haiti during the Revolution, Napoleon’s subsequent decision to sell the Louisiana Territory, and the ship’s responsibility in spreading the epidemic to Philadelphia in 1793.

As Smith asserts, the book focuses on ordinary people—working men and women, servants, slaves, soldiers, Britons, Africans, and Philadelphians—documenting and analyzing how they constructed and maintained their own lives, confronted the international forces that affected them, and, in the process, helped form the larger Atlantic world. (xiii)

For the Bolama colonists, ideals clashed with reality, and several cross-cultural misunderstandings prevailed. Their days were constantly punctuated by burials and disagreements. As their colony slowly withered, the Hankey eventually departed, “sailing on to new shores, carrying what soon became known as the ‘Bolama fever’” (156). Eventually, the ship carried the fever to the Caribbean and then to Philadelphia, where “church bells tolled unceasingly for the dead” (187).

The majority of documentation that remains concerning this history involves the leaders of the expedition or official records of the ship’s journey. Thus, for insight into the experiences of the ordinary people at the heart of this story, Smith creatively relies upon “historians’ general knowledge about the era [to] supplement the clues available about a few individuals” (40). Throughout the book, Smith constantly connects pieces of the story to world events, making this a good read for those with or without a lot of historical knowledge. Issues concerning the history of slavery and the slave trade are at the heart of this account, as is the history of a disease and the “well-meaning but naïve colonists” who unwittingly “encouraged both insects and the yellow fever virus to flourish” (155, 110).

In the end, British officials set the Hankey on fire upon its return, amid rumors that some sailors had contracted fevers “just from being near” this ship of death (244).

University of Hawaii at Hilo

Kerri A. Inglis


The Bretton Woods Conference of 1944 was a milestone in modern history. Meeting during the Second World War, representatives from forty-four nations gathered at a New Hampshire resort to plan a new international financial
order. The meeting created both the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, both of which still exist today. By fixing exchange rates among currencies, it established the dollar as the international currency and marked the beginning of a world economy centered on the United States.

With extensive, original research, Benn Steil has rewritten the history of the conference. Steil reveals the illusions of its two central figures: John Maynard Keynes, the most famous economist of the twentieth century and a senior member of the British delegation, and Harry Dexter White, the little-known assistant secretary of the US Treasury, who almost singlehandedly ran the conference. Anxious to leave his mark as the architect of a new international financial order, Keynes convinced himself that he had to accede to US demands in order to get the loan that Britain desperately needed. In fact, Keynes had limited influence on the conference, and Britain may well have gotten the loan without the Bretton Woods agreements.

Keynes’s proposal for a new international unit of currency, usually referred to as the “bancor” and composed of foreign exchange reserves held by central banks, was ahead of its time, and dismissed by White as impractical. The gyrations of currencies since fixed exchange rates were abandoned in 1973 suggest Keynes’s proposal still has relevance. Steil reveals Keynes’s mercurial qualities and British nationalism. Committed to free trade in his early years, in 1944 he fought to preserve imperial preference in order to salvage an international role for Britain.

Keynes’s illusions pale beside those of White. Convinced that Britain had to be forced to give up its tottering empire, White forced currency convertibility on a bankrupt nation. When convertibility finally occurred in 1947, it lasted only six weeks, as Britain’s reserves were rapidly depleted. White never wanted capital controls, but the Bretton Woods system could not work without them. White’s IMF never played the role of staving off devaluations by advanced economies that he envisioned. Its current role of watchdog for emerging economies is a later reinvention.

Committed to free trade as a panacea, which he thought would simply flow from a dollar-based standard, White ignored the need to restore Europe after the war. Only the Cold War and Marshall Plan made both reviving Europe and White’s vision of a global economy possible. White’s espionage for the Soviet Union grew from his deepest illusion, support for Communism, fully revealed here by the author.

Steil has made a major contribution to economic, intellectual, and political history, which is accessible to a wide audience and presents an endlessly fascinating portrait of two complicated men.

*Elizabethtown College*

Carl J. Strikwerda